


CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

This book is not to be taken
from the Reading Room.

WHEN DONE WITH, RETURN AT ONCE TO

SHELF 2, A, 5



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

Cornell University Library
PA 191.P37 1875

An introduction to Greek and Latin etymo



3 1924 021 600 022

olin

PA

191

P37

1875

L.R. Jones -

Jones Coll. Camb

Tenues.

Media

Aspirata

Labials

π

β

ϕ

Frittonals

π

γ

χ

Dentals

t

γ

θ

AN INTRODUCTION

TO

GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGY.



AN INTRODUCTION

TO

GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGY.

BY

JOHN PEILE, M.A. 1858-1910

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE,
FORMERLY TEACHER OF SANSKRIT IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF CAMBRIDGE.


THIRD AND CORRECTED EDITION.

out of print

London :
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1875.

[All Rights reserved.]

A.10033
SJ



Cambridge :

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

THIS edition differs from the first principally by the attempt which I have made to give a more complete explanation on physiological grounds of the phonetic changes in Greek and Latin. I have tried to describe, with more or less fulness, all the sounds which are now heard in Europe, with the exception of those of certain races, as the Slavonic, Keltic, and others, which seemed too remote from my subject; because I wished, first, to provide a list of sounds which, in all probability, contain all those of the old Greek and Italian; and, secondly, to give an account of the mechanism of speech which, though short and necessarily incomplete, should yet be sufficient to supply the reader with the means of estimating the character of the changes submitted to him in particular languages. It is only when we have some clear understanding of the action of the different organs employed in speech that we can realize the nature of such changes as labialism, palatisation, the different corruptions of the dentals, the changes of *s* into *sh*, *r*, *th*, and the like—changes which are historically certain, but of which the historians of language often give very unsatisfactory, because unmethodical, explanations (as Corssen), or leave them altogether unexplained, as Cur-

tius generally does. In this matter I have got most help from Prof. Lepsius's *Standard Alphabet* and Prof. Whitney's criticisms of the same in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*; from Mr Alex. J. Ellis's *Early English Pronunciation*, a work which, though its object is special, contains most valuable suggestions on the general history of language; but chiefly from the *Principles of Speech* and *Visible Speech* of Mr A. Melville Bell, who has given a full, and, so far as I can judge, a most accurate analysis of the different sounds, especially of the English, but with incidental reference to those of many other languages: the diagrams which accompany his latter work will be found extremely useful to illustrate the description of the sounds which I have given in Chapter IV.; the most important of them may be had separately in a little work called *English Visible Speech for the Million*, at the cost of one shilling. Lastly, on this, as on many other points, I have profited much by the sound judgment and originality of view shewn throughout Mr Roby's most excellent *Latin Grammar*. I have already, in the first edition of this work, acknowledged my obligations to Pott, Benfey, Curtius, Corssen, Schleicher, Leo Meyer, and the *Zeitschrift*¹.

I have slightly modified the arrangement of the book. I have abandoned the lecture-form, but I have not attempted to do away altogether with the lecture-character, thinking it best adapted to my purpose. I still wish it to serve principally as an Introduction to the great works of Curtius and Corssen. I have, therefore, been at pains to develope principles and to suggest

¹ Reference is made in this edition to the third edition of Curtius's *Griechische Etymologie*, and to the second edition of Corssen's *Aussprache*, &c., except in one or two places, where the contrary is stated.

44 questions which could not be fully solved within my limits, and must receive their answer elsewhere. I did not wish to make a mere handbook of linguistic facts; a better could not be made than Schleicher's. Since, however, my book has been recommended by the Cambridge Board of Classical Studies, as one of the books of reference for the Tripos Examination, I have thought it better to bring the slight disquisitions on the nature of roots, &c., which were formerly scattered, into one chapter—the Third. I have rewritten many passages which were either obscure or incomplete: on one point—the nature of Assimilation—I have considerably modified the account formerly given. I have added new examples in some places; but I have never attempted to give all that could be given, for the plain reason that the student should be left to find them for himself. I wish to stimulate, not to satisfy enquiry. I am afraid that the changes I have made may have led occasionally to some repetition, and perhaps to some inconsistencies; if so, I must plead in excuse that I have been obliged both to write and to print, at considerable intervals, as I could get time from pressing work.

I have received valuable suggestions from several reviewers of the first edition; more especially from Prof. Whitney, in the *Journal* already referred to; from Prof. Joseph B. Mayor, in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*; and from Dr Wagner, in the *Academy*. Some of the arguments of the first two writers are referred to in special notes. Prof. Mayor's dissent from my general principle arises mainly, I venture to think, from a misapprehension of it, for which I am responsible¹. The idea that man was actuated in speaking only by laziness

¹ See especially note to page 9.

had certainly not crossed my mind till I found it attributed to me by Prof. Mayor. I hope that I have now made this clear in my first chapter. Since, however, he does not seem to believe that even the desire for ease of articulation is the principal cause of change in language, and as he imagines that this view is peculiar to myself, I may quote here a passage from Corssen, in which, by an odd coincidence, he is mentioning the assent of different philologists to this very doctrine; the passage is new, in the second edition of his book (1870)¹. He says:

¹ [*Aussprache* &c. II. 35. For a recent criticism of the doctrine see a pamphlet by Mr Fennell, Fellow of Jesus College, called "An attempt to shew that the causes of phonetic change cannot all be referred to the one principle of Desire for ease of Articulation." Mr Fennell holds that I derived this "German error" from Baudry and Curtius. Baudry of course is not a German; and no part of Curtius' great work is employed in the development of this theory: it is doubtless assumed by him, as I thought (before seeing Mr Fennell's pamphlet) that it was assumed by all philologists. I assumed it myself, and the special characteristic of my work was the arrangement of the phenomena of the Greek and Latin languages (as they had not been arranged by any other writer) in order to illustrate—not to prove—this doctrine. That some of my explanations would turn out erroneous, I did not doubt at the time when the second edition was published (see page 81=75 ed. 2); and I have altered some points of detail in the present one: in the statement of the theory I have made only verbal changes where some passages had been misunderstood. Mr Fennell is confident that the theory is doomed. I do not share that anticipation. I maintain that the cause of phonetic change is the striving, conscious or unconscious, for ease of articulation, with certain limitations which are fully set forth. Mr Fennell spends his force in arguing that the *conscious* striving for ease of articulation is not the only cause. I need not say that I quite agree with him. To the *unconscious* striving Mr Fennell devotes 18 lines (on page 9 of his pamphlet.) He therein maintains that it is "less probable that there may be a universal tendency to economise power in unconscious than in conscious efforts"—apparently on the ground that a community whose occupation obliged them to shout a great deal would rather develop a taste for increased expenditure. I do not know what might happen in this extraordinary community of shouting men, women, and children; but the ordinary street-cries seem to be a practical refutation of Mr Fennell's hypothesis. 1875.]

“Je mehr die Jugendfrische der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung eines Volkes abnimmt und die Macht der Gedankenbildung im Volksgeiste vorherrschend wird, desto mehr neigt es dahin mit der möglichst geringen leiblichen Anstrengung der Lungen und Sprachwerkzeuge den Zweck der lautlichen Bezeichnung jenes Gedankengehaltes durch seine Sprache zu erreichen. Schleicher sagt (*die Deutsche Sprache*, s. 49), ‘Alle Veränderung der Laute, die im Verlaufe des sprachlichen Lebens eintritt, ist zunächst und unmittelbar Folge des Strebens unseren Sprachorganen die Sache leicht zu machen; Bequemlichkeit der Aussprache, Ersparung an Muskelthätigkeit, ist das hier wirkende Agens.’ Curtius findet in der Regelmässigen Vertretung der Laute wie in den vereinzelt Abweichungen derselben ‘eine einzige Grundrichtung, die der Verwitterung, welche, schärfer gefasst, in der schlafferen Articulation gewisser Laute bestand’ (*Gr. Et.* s. 66 f.)...In Uebereinstimmung mit ihnen sagt auch F. Baudry, *Grammaire Comparée*, I. 85: ‘En résumé, comme il arrive pour tout acte humain, le langage livré à lui-même tend à s’exercer avec la moindre action, ou, ce qui revient au même, avec l’action la plus commode possible.’”

Lastly, I have to thank the Rev. W. W. Skeat, the well-known editor of the *Vision of Piers the Plowman*, for many valuable suggestions, principally in English etymology; and H. Bendall, M.A., of Christ’s College, for the very complete indices which accompany this edition.

JOHN PEILE.

TRUMPINGTON,
Dec. 21, 1871.

[The present edition (1875) has been revised and slightly enlarged. I now regard the nature of vocal-

intensification as doubtful; and I have endeavoured in Chap. VI. to state the different arguments without attempting to draw a positive conclusion. I have also pointed out in Chap. VII. the strong objections to Corssen's view of the influence of accent in Latin. These two points (which are to some extent connected) still need fuller investigation. I had hoped to do more in the last two years than I have been able to accomplish.]

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PHONETIC CHANGE.

Nature of phonetic change, 1. Its cause, 3. Results of this law of change, 5. Different changes in different languages, 7. Uncertainty in the determination of special causes, 8. Application of this principle, 10. Apparent exceptions to it, 13. Different theories upon this subject, 14. Results of the combinations of phonetic laws of different peoples, 16. Erroneous spelling to suit supposed etymologies, 18.

Note on the derivation of Latin words from Greek, 19.

CHAPTER II.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN PEOPLES.

Classification of the Indo-European peoples, 22.

- (i) Aryan or Asiatic, 22.
- (ii) South-European, 23.
- (iii) North-European, *ib.*

Their degrees of relationship, 24. Fick's doctrine of European Unity, 25. Connection between the Latin and Keltic as given by Schleicher, 26. Counter-arguments by Ebel, 27. Nature of the arguments, 28.

The Hellenic subdivisions, 29.

- (i) Doric, hard and soft, 29.
- (ii) Aeolic, 30.
 - 1. Lesbian, 30.
 - 2. Boeotian, *ib.*
 - 3. Thessalian, *ib.*

- (iii) Ionic, 31. Differences of Ionic and Attic, 31. Supposed old Ionic, 32.

Is the original people properly called Aryan? 34. Importance sometimes given erroneously to Sanskrit, *ib.* Necessary cautions, 30.

Note on the non-Indo-European languages found in Europe, 39.

CHAPTER III.

ROOTS AND SUFFIXES.

What is a "root"? 41. Connection between roots and ideas, 42. Definition of a root, 43. Each language has its own roots, 44. Secondary roots, 45; formed by adding initial letters (?), 46; by vowel-change, 46; and especially by adding consonants at the end of the roots, 46. Origin of these secondary roots, 47. Secondary roots formed with a final vowel, 49. Pronominal roots, 50. They denote relation in space, 51.

Bases—intermediate between roots and words, 52. Formative suffixes, 52. Verbal suffixes, *ib.* Nominal suffixes, *ib.* Denominative or nominal verbs, 53. Stem-suffixes, *ib.* What were these suffixes originally? 54. Probably the verbal were in the main common roots, 54. The nominal were in the main pronominal roots, 55. Are the fuller or the shorter forms of the suffixes the older? 56. Inflexional suffixes not to be described here, 57.

CHAPTER IV.

SOUNDS.

The sounds of the original language, 59. Extension of the vowels, *ib.* Scantiness of this alphabet, 61. Fuller list of sounds to be now considered, *ib.*

Physiological difference between vowels and consonants, 62. Difference in the material of speech, 63. "Hard," "surd," or "breath-sounds," distinguished from "soft," "sonant," or "voice-sounds," *ib.*

CONSONANTS.

Double classification of consonants.

I. According to the nature of the contact.

- (i) Momentary or explosive consonants, 64.
- (ii) Continuous or fricative consonants, 66.
 - 1. Nasals, *ib.*
 - 2. Central consonants, 67.
 - 3. Lateral consonants, *ib.*
 - 4. Laxly vibrated or trilled consonants, 68.

II. According to the organs employed.

- (i) Fauicals (?), 69. Different views of the nature of *h*, 70.
- (ii) Back-palatals or "gutturals," *k*, *g*, *ng*, *ch* (Germ.), *g* (Germ.), 73.

- (iii) Middle-palatals or "palatals," *ch* (?), *j* (?), *c*, *ch* (Germ. soft), *y*, 74.
- (iv) Mixed-palatals, *s*, *z*, *sh*, *zh*, 75.
- (v) Linguals or cerebrals, *t*, *d*, *n*, *ŋ*, 76.
- (vi) Front-palatals or "dentals," *t*, *d*, *n* (English), *r*, *l*, 77.
t, *d*, *n* (Sanskrit), *p* (*th*), *ṣ* (*dh*), 78.
- (vii) Labio-dentals, *f*, *v* (English), 79.
- (viii) Labials, *p*, *b*, *m*, *hw*, *w*, *f* (?), *v* (central German), *ib*.

General rules to determine the strength of sounds, 80. Momentary sounds, stronger than protractible, 81. Hard sounds apparently stronger than soft each in their own class, but this is uncertain, 82. Unaspirated sounds stronger than the corresponding aspirates, 84. Of the different classes the gutturals are the strongest, 85. Different explanation given by Prof. Whitney, 86. General rules hardly possible for protracted sounds, 88. Among the nasals *m* may be stronger than *n*, *ib*. Of the spirants, *y* is the strongest; *h* is the weakest in Greek; *s* is stronger than *r*, *ib*. Central sounds more difficult than lateral, 89. *r* passes into *w*, *ib*.

VOWELS.

Classification of vowels, 90. Vowels and glides, *ib*.

I. Nine "primary" or "close" vowels, &c.

- (i) Three "back," *ib*.
- (ii) Three "front," *ib*.
- (iii) Three "mixed," *ib*.

And crosswise three "high," three "mid," and three "low," 91.

II. Nine "wide" or "open" vowels, modifications of the nine close vowels, *ib*.

III. Eighteen "round" vowels, modifications of the first eighteen, *ib*.

Number of English vowels, 93. The neutral vowel, *ib*. Reasons for commencing with *a*, *ib*. Two lines of vowels necessary, 94. Dubious vowels, 95.

- (i) The "front" vowels, 95.
- (ii) The "back" and "rounded" vowels, 96.

Vowel pyramid, 97. Terms "open" and "close," how far convertible with long and short, 98. General rules of vowel-strength, 99. Regular passage from *a* down each line, 100. No useful rules for passage from one line to another, 101.

CHAPTER V.

THE INDO-EUROPEAN ALPHABET.

The Indo-European Alphabet exhibited in roots and words, 102.

I. Momentary sounds, 103—141.

1. Hard sounds, к, 103. т, 108. р, 112. (Pott's theory of secondary roots formed from primary roots by a preposition which was afterwards mutilated), 115.
2. Soft sounds, г, 117. д, 121. (Generalization of roots) 123. б, 126.
3. Aspirates, 127. Did the original language possess hard as well as soft aspirates? 128. гх, 132. дх, 135. бх, 138. (Possibility of some of our words being older than the Indo-European roots), 140.

II. Continuous sounds, 141—165.

1. Nasals, н, 142. м, 144.
2. Fricatives or Spirants, 147. х, 148. с, 150. в, 153.
3. Liquids, 157. л, 158. (Necessity of distinguishing between different roots which have the same form), 159. р, 161.

Concluding remarks, 163.

Note I. On Grimm's Law, 165.

Note II. On the Indo-European division of the year, 169.

CHAPTER VI.

DYNAMIC CHANGE.

Classes of dynamic change, or very old phonetic changes, 172. Reduplication, Vowel-Intensification, and Nasalisation, 173.

REDUPLICATION, 173—188.

Reduplication the oldest and simplest method, 173. Evidence of this derived from the language of savages and of children, 174. Reduplication, first in imitative words, then generally, 175; and in alliteration, 176. Slight traces in the formation of superlatives, 179. Regular formation of frequentatives or intensives, 180. Frequent loss of the original meaning, 181. Reduplication employed to distinguish protracted from momentary action, 183. Loss of the original object, 188.

VOWEL-INTENSIFICATION, 189—215.

Schleicher's doctrine of two steps in each vowel-scale, 189. Most recognisable in Sanskrit; and most regularly employed there, 190. Vowel-scales in the Gothic, 191; in Lithuanian, 192; in Greek and Latin, *ib.*

(i) The A-scale, 192—198.

Difficulty of distinguishing the two steps, 192. Different methods of distinguishing them in Greek; especially the employment of the existing division of *α* into *a*, *e*, *o*, 194. Traces of the same method in Latin, 196. Advantage of the different symbols for long vowels in the Greek, *ib.* Quantitative increase, 197.

(ii) The I-scale, 198—202.

Occurrence of *ai* as an intensified form of *i*, 200.

(iii) The U-scale, 202—204.

U intensified to *au*, 203.

Nature of the evidence given by the verbs for these changes, 204. Evidence of the nouns, 206. No clear proof of a second step in the original language, 208. Possibility that even the first step was originally phonetic, 209. These changes sometimes attributed to accent, 211. Vagueness of the term "accent," 212. Different constituents of emphasis, 213.

NASALISATION, 215—220.

Nasalisation seemingly analogous to vowel increase, especially if it arose from a nasalised vowel, 215. If the nasal was from the first an independent sound, it seems possible that it arose from a misplaced suffix, 216. Probability of this as shewn by the verbs, 217. The nouns cannot be so explained, 218. Ambiguity of the evidence, 219.

CHAPTER VII.**VOWEL-CHANGE.**

Phonetic change due to two causes—Weak Articulation and Indistinct Articulation, 221. Weak Articulation to be first considered under four heads, *ib.*

1. Substitution, 222.
2. Loss, *ib.*
3. Assimilation, 224.
4. Dissimilation, *ib.*

The symbols of the Greek and Latin Alphabets, 225. The Greek vowel-symbols, 226. The symbols H and Ω, 226. The symbols Φ and X 227, Θ 228. Aspirate symbols not needed at Rome, *ib.* The sibilants, *ib.* Koppa, 229. The Latin F and H, *ib.* Latin borrowed symbols, 230.

I. Substitution, 230—295.

1. Splitting of the A-sound into *a*, *e*, *o*, 230—246.

Found throughout Europe, 231. History of the change from A to *e*, 232 : from A to *o*, 233. Change from A to *e*, established in Graeco-Italian, 234. The change from *a* to *o* less frequent, 235. Application of the new vowels, 236. Especial gain of the Greek language hereby, 237. Traces of similar division of *ā*, 239. Probable sounds of these letters, 241. Of A, *ib.* Of E and O, *ib.* Probable difference in quality between *ε* and *η*, *o* and *ω*, 242. Correspondence of Latin with modern Italian, 244. Table of single vowel sounds in Greek and Italian, 246.

2. Greek diphthongs, 247—262.

AI=*ai*, *ei*, *oi*; AU=*au*, *eu*, *ou*, 247. Diphthongs were originally "double sounds," *ib.* History of the change of dissimilar diphthongs in Greek, 248. Tendency to drop the second vowel, the first being sometimes modified, 250. Greek *ai*, 251. Greek *ei*, 252. Greek *oi*, 253. Greek *au*, 254. Greek *ou*, *ib.* Greek *eu*, 255. Diphthongs with first vowel long, *ib.* Greek *ui*, 256. Similar diphthongs, *ib.* Recurrence of the same vowel, 260.

3. Latin diphthongs, 262—271.

AI=*ai*, *ei*, *oi*; AU=*au*, *eu*, *ou*, 262. Latin *ai*, *ib.* Latin *ei*, 264. Latin *oi*, 266. Latin *au*, 268. Latin *eu*, 269. Latin *ou*, 270.

4. Weakening of *υ* in Greek, 271—273. *υ*=upsilon, 271. Parallel affections of *u* in other languages, 273.

5. Further (sporadic) substitution in Greek, 274—279.

- (i) Weakening of *a* to *ι*, 274.
- (ii) Weakening of *a* to *υ*, 277.
- (iii) Weakening of *υ* to *ι*, 279.

6. Further vowel-substitution (Latin), 280—295. Peculiar weakness of the Latin vowel-system, 280. Contrast between the Greek and the Latin, 282.

- (i) Weakening of formative syllables, 283.

- (ii) Weakening in composition, 289.
 - (a) of the first member of the compound, *ib.*
 - (b) where the second member is weakened, 290.
- (iii) Weakening in reduplicated forms, 293 :
 - (a) of the reduplicated syllable, *ib.*
 - (b) of the radical syllable, 294.

II. Assimilation, 295—310.

Vowel-change modified by external causes, 295. Hardly at all in Greek, *ib.*, but frequently in Latin, 296. Principle of Assimilation, 297.

- (i) Affinities produced by the avoidance of a difficult combination, *ib.*
 - (ii) Affinities produced by ease of combination, 298.
1. Vowel-Assimilation caused by consonants, 299.
 - (i) The vowel *u*, 300.
 - (ii) The vowel *e*, 303.
 - (iii) The vowel *i*, 304.
 2. Vowel-Assimilation caused by vowels, 307. Apparent influence of the vowel *i*, 308.

III. Dissimilation, 310—313.

Less frequent in its operation, acts principally as a bar to further changes, 310.

IV. Loss, 313—332.

1. Loss of Greek vowels, 313.
2. Loss of Latin vowels, 315. Loss of *a*, *ib.* Of *o*, *ib.* Of *u*, *ib.* Of *e*, 316. Of *i*, 317; *i* is especially lost in compounds, 319. What was the immediate cause of this loss? 320. Middle stage in Latin between a vowel fully sounded and entirely lost, 321. Loss in and of the final syllable arising from its never being accented, 324. Loss in quantity, *ib.* Loss of quantity when the final consonant was lost, 326. Loss of quantity in originally final vowels, 327. Loss of letters in the final syllable, 328.

Note on Latin accentuation, 330. Common law, *ib.* Assumed older law, 331.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSONANTAL CHANGE.

Superiority of the Greek over the Latin thus far manifested, 333.
Greater strength of the Latin consonants, 333.

I. Substitution, 335—364.

1. Change of hard (unaspirated) letters to soft, 335—338.

Change of κ to γ and to g , *ib.* Peculiar change of the hard guttural in Latin, 336.. Change of τ to δ and d , 337. Change of p to β and b , 338.

2. Further substitution for momentary (unaspirated) sounds, 338—340.

Change of ν to l in Latin, 338. Change of ν to r , 339.

3. Substitution for Spirants, 340—357.

A. Greek substitutes for the Spirants, 340—351.

(a) Changes of γ in Greek, 341—343.

(i) $\gamma = \iota$, 341.

(ii) $\gamma = \epsilon$, 342.

(iii) γ = the rough breathing, *ib.*

(iv) γ is lost, *ib.*

(b) Changes of s , 343—346.

(i) $s = \sigma$, 343.

(ii) s = rough breathing, 344.

(iii) s is lost, 345.

(c) Changes of ν , 346—351.

(i) $\nu = \phi$, 346.

(ii) $\nu = \upsilon$, 348.

(iii) ν = rough breathing, *ib.*

(iv) $\nu = \beta$, *ib.*

(v) $\nu = \mu$, 349.

B. Substitutes for the Spirants in Latin, 351—357.

(a) Changes of γ in Latin, 351.

(i) $\gamma = i$, *ib.*

(ii) γ is lost, *ib.*

(b) Changes of *s*, 352(i) *s=s*, *ib.*(ii) *s=r*, 353. Old Italian *z*, 354.(iii) *s* is lost, *ib.*(c) Changes of *v*, 355.(i) *v=u*, *ib.*(ii) *v* is lost, *ib.* *v* not=*m*, *ib.*Probable sound of *v* in Latin, *ib.*

4. Changes of the Aspirates in Latin, 357—364.

The Latin aspirate *f*, 357. *f* represents original *βη* and *δη* at the beginning of a word, 358; sometimes even *γη*, *ib.* The *h* was commonly dropped in the middle of a word, 351. Changes of *γη*, 361. The aspirates when initial pass into breaths, when medial into soft letters, 361. Explanation of the appearance of the soft letters, 362.

5. Substitution of a Vowel for a Consonant, 364. (i) *α* for *ν*.
(ii) *υ* for *λ*.

II. Loss, 364—379.

1. Loss of aspiration in Greek, 364. This loss only sporadic in Greek though regular in Latin, 365.

2. Loss of one or more out of a group of consonants, 366. Possible origin of these groups, *ib.*

(i) Initial loss; principally of *s* and *ν* both in Greek and Latin, 367. Further loss in Latin, 370. Loss of initial *c* when standing alone, 371.

(ii) Medial loss; hardly found in Greek, 372; common and irregularly in Latin, *ib.*

(iii) Final loss, 374. Monotony of consonantal terminations in Greek, *ib.* The *ν ἐφελευστικόν*, 376. Greater range in Latin, *ib.* Loss of final *s*, 377. Loss of final *m*, 378. Loss of final *t*, *ib.*

III. Assimilation, 379—400.

1. The Greek Aspirates, 372—384.

Pronunciation of the Greek Aspirates, 380. Probably they were not sounded as spirants, *ib.* Arguments to prove they were really aspirate sounds, 381. Slight variations in use, 384.

2. General rules of Assimilation in Greek, 385—394.

A. Complete Assimilation, 385.

- (i) Assimilation of the first sound, *ib.*
- (ii) Assimilation of the second sound, 386.
- (iii) Modification of both sounds where the first is a hard guttural or dental, 387. There is no such change of a labial, 390. Change of a soft guttural or dental, *ib.*

B. Incomplete Assimilation, 391.

- (i) Euphonic changes, *ib.*
- (ii) Changes caused by nasals, 392.
- (iii) Changes of nasals, *ib.*
- (iv) Change of τ to σ , *ib.*
- (v) Changes of v , 393.
- (vi) Other exceptional forms, *ib.*

3. General rules of Assimilation in Latin, 394.

A. Complete Assimilation, *ib.*

- (i) Assimilation of the first letter, *ib.*
- (ii) Assimilation of second letter, 395.
- (iii) Modification of both sounds, *ib.*

B. Incomplete Assimilation, 396.

- (i) Euphonic changes, 374.
- (ii) Changes caused by nasals, *ib.*
- (iii) Changes of t to s , *ib.* Assibilation of c and t , 398. Assibilation of c late, except in the provincial dialects, *ib.* Assibilation of t a little earlier, 400.

IV. Dissimilation, 400—402.

- 1. Change of a dental, 401.
- 2. Loss of aspiration in Greek, *ib.* And of initial reduplicated consonant, *ib.*
- 4. Latin *-aris* and *-alis*, 402.

CHAPTER IX.

INDISTINCT ARTICULATION.

Changes produced by want of clearness in pronunciation, 403.

1. Labialism, 404—412.

Change of κ to π and p , 404. Possibility of this change, 405. Caused by parasitic v in Graeco-Italian, 406. Variation in Italy, 408. History of the Latin q , 409. Change of g to β and b , 410. Change of gn to ϕ , 411.

2. Dentalism, 412—415.

Change of κ to τ , 412. Change of g to δ , 414. Change of d to b , 415.

3. Parasitic d before y or i , 415—421.

The apparent change of γ into ζ , 416. γ with parasitic δ appears

- (i) as ζ , 417;
- (ii) as δi , ib ;
- (iii) as δe , 418;
- (iv) as δ , ib .

Estimate of the probability of these changes, 420.

4. Parasitic y after δ , 422.

5. Aspirating unaspirated letters, 423—428.

Involuntary aspiration of hard letters; found in Sanskrit and in Greek, 423. No certain example of the aspiration of soft sounds, 425. Aspiration in Greek and Latin at the beginning of a word, ib . It began in Italy first among the provincials, 427.

6. Auxiliary (inorganic) vowels, 428—434.

Character of these sounds; most common in Greek, 428.

- (i) Initial vowels, 430. Very rare before an explosive sound, ib .
- (ii) Medial vowels, 431. The "connecting vowel," 432. Auxiliary vowels in Latin, 433.

7. Auxiliary (inorganic) consonants, 434.

Conclusion, 435.

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS.

In Sanskrit words *ch* and *j* denote nearly the same sounds as in English.

- *c* denotes the palatal sibilant.
 *n̄* nasal.
 *m* *anusvāra* or after-sound.
 *t̄, d̄, n̄, s̄* denote the cerebral letters.

In Lithuanian words *ũ* denotes *o* followed by a slight *a*-sound.

- *q̄, &c.*, denote vowels followed by a suppressed nasal.

- $\overset{sz}{\underset{s}{\vee}}$ Slavonic. } denote *sh*.

- $\underset{z}{\vee}$ denotes weak (French) *j*, = *zh* (page 75).

Roots are denoted by the symbol $\sqrt{}$ and Indo-European roots are printed in capital letters; so $\sqrt{\Delta D}$ = Lat. \sqrt{ed} = Gr. $\sqrt{\epsilon\delta}$.

All vowels should be pronounced as in Italian, subject to the modifications in Chapter IV. The English sounds are denoted by the symbols (not italicised) in brackets: thus (*ee*) denotes the English equivalent of the vowel *i*.

ERRATA.

p. 33, n.	For <i>Coe</i> ph	read <i>Choe</i> ph.
p. 49, n.	„ <i>Anzeige</i>	„ <i>Anzeigen</i> .
p. 59, n. 2	„ clearly	„ clear.
p. 97, l. 23	„ \tilde{a}	„ \tilde{a} .
p. 193, n. 2, l. 14	„ \tilde{a}	„ \tilde{a} .
p. 274, margin	„ A =	„ A = <i>i</i> .

INTRODUCTION TO GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PHONETIC CHANGE.

THE chief subject of this book will be the Laws of Phonetic Change in Greek and Latin. As the term may probably require explanation, I will illustrate my meaning by an example.

In the word *δίδωμι* we have three syllables. Beginning with the last syllable *μι*, we have a combination of sound, which a little comparison with other words in Greek or other languages (Sanskrit and Lithuanian) will convince us, denotes the pronoun of the first person "I." This comparison will shew us that the syllable is sometimes reduced to the mere consonant *m*; thus we have in Latin *sum*, *inquam*¹; and if we observe that the 1st person singular of the imperfect in Latin (e. g. *fereba-m*) compared with the same person in Greek (*ἔφερον*) always shews an *m* in the one language by an *ν* in the other, we shall conclude that for some reason or other the Greeks could change this older *m* into a later *ν*. But further, by comparison, we shall see reason to believe that this *μι*

CH. I.
Nature of
phonetic
change.

¹ Also our own "am" (as-mi). In the old Northumbrian gloss of the Latin Gospels we find "ic beom" (I am), Mark ix. 19; "ic geseom" (I see), Mark viii. 24, &c. See the Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospel of St Mark, ed. Skeat, p. xxxi. The old High German *pim* or *bim* has become *bin* in modern German, like *ἔφερον*.

of the Greeks is not the oldest form of the syllable; that as it sank into *m* or *n*, so it had previously descended from an older form *ma*: I say "descended," for it is clear to any one who attempts the sounds, that *a*, pronounced as in "father," is a fuller and stronger sound than *i*. One piece of this evidence is the termination of the 1st person plural, which is *μες* in (Doric) Greek, *mus* in Latin, but *mas* in Sanskrit (a form which a probable analysis explains as *ma* + *sa* or *I* + *he*, i.e. *we*; *tas* is *ta* + *sa* or *thou* + *he* = *ye*); and as we shall find that in Greek *ε* often comes from *a*, and in Latin *u* from *a*, but not *vice versâ*, we shall infer (from this and other indications which I have not time to dwell upon more) that this *μ* is traceable to an older and stronger form *ma*. But it is clear—and this is the point to which I wish to call attention—that the change of sound was not intended to imply any change of meaning; *ma* meant *I*, and the meaning was kept by the most corrupted form of the syllable; not of course that the Greek who said *ἔφερον* was conscious every time that the *ν* had originally been the personal pronoun; the pronoun had sunk with the lapse of time into a mere grammatical suffix; but *ἔφερον* still signified "I carried," and conveyed the same idea to the hearer of that day, as when the words "there-carry-I" establish their claim to be selected out of many others which would have done as well, or nearly as well, to express the action of carrying in past time. Here then, I repeat, the new sound was not meant to convey a new meaning.

Let us now take the second syllable *δω*. Here we have long *o*. But we have *δό-σις*, *δότηρ*, even *δί-δο-μεν* in the first person plural; and if we look at similar verbs *ἵστημι*, *τίθημι*, we shall see the same long vowel only in the singular of the present. We shall conclude therefore that for some reason this vowel became lengthened in these three persons from a simpler form *δο*, which conveys the simple idea of giving. Here we shall at present be in some doubt whether any change of meaning was thereby

expressed. Let us pass to the first syllable where we shall find the explanation more easily. First of all a comparison with the Sk. *dadāmi* will shew us that the Greek *δι* is not the oldest form of the syllable, but that (just as in the last syllable) *da* has been weakened to *δι*. But why this first syllable at all? Why could not the Hindus and Greeks have said *dami* or *δομι* to express "I give," just as the Slavonians said *damī*, the Lithuanians *dū-mi*, and the Latins *do* (for *da-o*)? One thing is quite clear, *dāda* cannot be a weakened form of *da*: it requires much more labour to pronounce; and this labour could not have been taken except for an object. We are of necessity forced upon the conclusion that a change of meaning was intended by the double sound. The result to which our analysis leads us is that in the word *δίδωμι* are exemplified the results of two radically different principles of change; the one by which a change of meaning is intended to be expressed; the other by which no such change of meaning is intended. Both changes are seen in the first syllable *δι*, the last only in the last syllable *μι*. The first class of changes I call *dynamic*; the second I call *phonetic*.

*voluntary
phonetic*

What is the motive for this latter change? The reason seems to have been twofold, though each caused the same result. We saw above that the operation of this law of change was to *weaken* the older form; that is, to change it to something which required less effort to produce.

Its cause.

And the general cause of this change can have been nothing else but the striving for ease in articulation; the desire to facilitate utterance by substituting a simpler instead of a more difficult sound or sounds; sometimes consciously felt, but far more frequently (as in all human action) operating unconsciously as a habit: when experience has shewn which sounds or combination of sounds require least effort, those sounds are instinctively preferred. Thus there is a constant tendency in all our speech to reduce the word to such a form as may express the idea

with the least possible amount of labour consistent with clearness. This limitation is important. If a word be reduced too far, its identity is destroyed: two different words expressing different ideas may come to have the same form, and thus clearness is sacrificed. In order to avoid such confusion, a practical limitation is found in most languages; a sound once corrupted is not corrupted again¹. It is felt that ease of articulation may be purchased too dearly by the loss of the distinctive features of a word: and thus a striving for distinctness of form is called into existence by the very operation of the general law of change. But there are few results of this striving which need to be taken separately into account; because it almost invariably operates in simply stemming the action of that law². Sometimes indeed, but very rarely, the necessity for the distinct expression of what was in danger of becoming confused leads to actual change in a direction contrary to the common one; as for example in the change of the mediae into the tenues in Teutonic: and familiar instances of this retrograde tendency are the lengthening of the original vowel, e.g. in *τιθείς* for *τιθεντς*, or in *λέγω* for *λεγο-μι*, commonly called "compensation." In such words there has been a loss of consonants, and a syllable is felt to be too much weakened, therefore the vowel is strengthened to make up for the loss. Sometimes a vowel in one syllable appears to be lengthened to compensate

¹ This usage is hardly regular enough to deserve the name of a law, but it deserves notice. Instances, both where it is observed and where it is not, will appear in the Latin vowel-change.

² I am happy to find myself in substantial agreement on this point with Mr Roby. He writes (*Grammar*, p. 11), "Involuntary phonetic change is the result of a struggle between the physical tendency to reduce the effort of articulation, and the intellectual or instinctive desire of preserving any parts of a word which are characteristic of its meaning. The latter acts mainly by way of resistance, e.g. *ab* is much seldomer changed in composition than *sub*, because of the danger of confusion with *ad*. In the passive voice forms like *amabaris*, *amaberis*, *amareris* are shortened into *amabare*, &c., but *amaris* is not shortened into *amare* lest it should be confused with the pres. infin." By "involuntary phonetic change," Mr Roby denotes that change which I call simply "phonetic:" his "voluntary phonetic" is my "dynamic."

for the shortening of another syllable¹: here again we have a conscious attempt to maintain the fullness of the original word, an attempt which does not merely prevent change, but actually introduces it. The changes of Grimm's Law are probably examples of this compensation on a large scale.

This principle is put very well by Prof. Whitney²; "all articulate sounds," he says, "are produced by effort, by expenditure of muscular energy in the throat, lungs, and mouth. This effort, like every other that man makes, he has an instinctive disposition to seek relief from, to avoid: we may call it laziness, or we may call it economy: it is in fact either the one or the other according to the circumstances of each particular case: it is laziness when it gives up more than it gains: it is economy when it gains more than it abandons." Let us take examples of such loss or gain. The Indo-European form of the first person singular of the imperfect of BHAR, to bear, was *abharami* (Sk. *abharam*). Here the Greeks, as well as the Hindus, found the four-syllabled word too cumbrous for use: the stress probably fell upon the augment, because by the augment was expressed the fact that the bearing was in the past time, and the syllable which expressed this modification of the simple idea required emphasis: in consequence then of this emphasis upon the first syllable, the *i* of the last became less and less distinctly heard, until it disappeared altogether, and *abharami* appears as *abhara-m* in Sanskrit, as *ἔφερον* in Greek: where *ν* represents *m* by a phonetic law of the language, because the Greeks found *ν* an easier sound than *m* at the end of a

CH. I.

Results of
this law of
change.

¹ As in *λέως* by *λαός*, *ἄρπεδew* by *ἄρπεδαο*,—in the first of these cases Westphal (*Gr. Grammatik*, i. 163) assumes without a shadow of reason a middle contracted form *λέως*, before which *ε* is afterwards inserted. Another explanation is possible, that a consonant has been lost between the vowels, and that sometimes the preceding vowel is lengthened through compensation, sometimes the following one.

In *√σκεπ* from Ind.-Eur. *spak* (Lat. *√spec*, Sanskrit *√पाç*) we seem to have consonantal compensation. In *χιτών* and *κίθων*, we may have only Dissimilation (i.e. regular phonetic change), and in *τάφος* by *τέθηπα*.

² *Lectures on the Study of Language*, p. 69.

word. But the third person plural of the same tense was in the Indo-European *abharanti*: and this on the same principle was weakened in Sanskrit to *abharan*, in Greek to *ἔφερον*. We see then, as the result, that whilst each language gained a lighter form by each change, the Sanskrit retained distinct forms, which the Greek did not: the difference between the first person singular and the third person plural had to be expressed in some other way than by the grammatical forms: lightness was gained, but distinctness was sacrificed. In this case we must believe that the gain of lightness of pronunciation was felt to compensate for the loss of grammatical accuracy; for where confusion was felt to arise, new distinctions were made, sometimes new forms arose; for example, the periphrastic tenses, formed by auxiliary verbs, a practice almost universal in modern languages, but found also in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. As Prof. Curtius puts it: "the phonetic laws of some one tongue cause a certain form to perish; but forthwith there springs up a new one to supply its place. The original wealth melts away, yet the creative power of language continues to produce new treasures. Differences arise from primary unity: and variations of form thus newly brought forth are employed to distinguish shades of signification¹." These various forms were turned to better account by the Greek than by any other language. We have given an example where phonetic change produced confusion in the Greek: let us now take one where the variety, resulting from the same principle, was employed with admirable success in differentiation of meaning. Thus the gen. sing. and the nom. and acc. plural of *pad*, a foot, were all formed in Indo-European by the affix *-as*—*padas*. This is almost certain from the fact that the Sanskrit never possessed any different forms for the three cases: and if the requisite vowel-variety had existed in Indo-European,

¹ *Essay on the Results of Comparative Philology in reference to, Classical Scholarship*, p. 31.

it is exceedingly improbable that the Sanskrit should have suffered it to die out without leaving any trace behind. But if we turn to the Greek we find a very different state of things. In Greek, as in most of the European members of the family, the vowel *a* of the original speech was split up into the three sounds, *a*, *e*, and *o*. This important change will be fully considered hereafter. At present I only wish to say that it seems to have been in its origin purely phonetic: there is no reason to suppose that any change of meaning was intended to be expressed by this change of sound. But these sounds, found ready to hand, were employed by the Greek with marvellous skill. Thus, in our present example, the original *padas* could be differentiated into *ποδός* for the gen. sing., *πόδες* for the nom. plur., and *πόδας* for the acc. plur. No confusion between the different cases was any longer possible. The weakening of *a* into *a*, *e*, *o*, was turned in this instance by the Greek into clear gain; as in many others which will be given in their place.

The general effect of phonetic change is to substitute a weaker for a stronger sound. This is not always so, for reasons which I shall shortly point out; but the new sound or combination of sounds will always be an easier one for the speaker to pronounce under the circumstances in which it occurs. There are few single sounds of which it can be said that they are *universally* easier or more difficult than the rest. Some classes are generally conceded to be more difficult than others: but for many the difference of muscular effort is imperceptible, and must be so small that their interchange doubtless often depends upon other considerations as well as their relative strength. Every one knows what contradictory variations may be met with among his own acquaintance: one will pronounce *r* as *l*, another (though very much more rarely) *l* as *r*. Similar differences occur on a large scale in different nations; the Englishman avoids in divers ways the German *ch*: the German finds great difficulty in our

Different changes in different languages.

CH. I.

th. But as with the individual, so is it with the nation ; though with this important distinction, that in the single man special causes may co-operate with the general principle ; such as physical imperfections in the organs of speech and hearing ; nay, even caprice, if persisted in long enough, may result in habit and so produce various peculiarities of speech. But it cannot be maintained with any shew of probability that such causes could ever affect a whole nation. To explain widespread changes we must look for causes sufficiently wide in their operation. And I know no principle, except the conscious or unconscious economising of effort, which is adequate to explain the loss or transformation by a whole people of some sound which was certainly uttered by their forefathers¹.

Uncertainty in the determination of special causes.

It may perhaps be asked what special causes determined the different operation of this principle in different languages. This question—which amounts to an enquiry into the causes of diversity of language itself—cannot be answered here. No people has preserved unchanged all the letters of the original alphabet. Different peoples have modified it in different ways from causes at which we can give probable guesses, but which we can never certainly know. Occasionally we may see in the altered alphabet something which seems to correspond to the genius of the people which spoke it, or to be due to the country, climate and general circumstances among which they were placed. Thus we may think that we can see in the flexibility of the Greek language the impress of the versatility of the Greek genius, and the effect of that *λαμπρότατος αἰθήρ* amid which at least the most brilliant section of the Greek family lived : whilst the effect of the hot enervating climate of India may be looked for in the

¹ Mr Fennell (*Attempt*, &c. p. 29) does indeed think that labialism was "a probable result of defective or careless hearing." Did then the whole Athenian people grow gradually and evenly deaf to such an extent as to produce labialism? Presumably, when that result was attained, the defect of hearing was taken away from them.

numerous weakened forms of the consonants in Sanskrit. Thus lacking energy to bring the root of the tongue firmly against the back of the palate, the Hindus produced in some cases instead of the original *k* a peculiar sibilant (denoted variously in philological works by *s'* or *ç*). In like manner, probably through the influence of an adjoining *s*, they changed *k* into *ch*, and *g* into *j*, the sound of *ch* and *j* being much the same as in England. Such weakenings are especially common in Sanskrit: and that they are due to some extent to the climate of India would probably be denied by few. Within the same language we may see variations arising from difference of occupation or circumstances. The different ways in which men have to exercise their voices will affect certain classes of sounds: and these differences, if found among a considerable body of people within the same area, have a great tendency to be perpetuated¹.

¹ Prof. Jos. B. Mayor in a review of the first edition of this work (*Camb. Journal of Philology*, No. 6) holds that the causes of difference of articulation may be roughly classified as "mental, physical, and circumstantial." By the first he means "excitability, vehemence, nervousness, preciseness, artistic sensibility, the analogical disposition always seeking after resemblances, and its opposite which we may call the analytical disposition, always seeking after differences" (p. 332). I certainly should not deny that all these causes have weight; but they are personal, not peculiar to any large body of people living together: therefore they have little tendency to perpetuate themselves, and affect language: they die out with the individual. A quick excitable person often does drop half his syllables, but his son does not do so, unless he is also excitable; and if (according to Prof. Mayor) a man of "artistic sensibility" has some appropriate method of pronunciation, the peculiarity is at least not caught by his companions or commonly inherited by his descendants. The more intellectual causes referred to by Prof. Mayor, act principally, though not exclusively, on mixed languages: they will be noticed at the end of this chapter. Under the second class—physical causes—are given "dullness of hearing and defectiveness in the organs of speech." With this I quite agree, and also with the third class, in which are mentioned the effect of cold, living in the open air as a labourer, a hunter, or a sailor, &c. Under all these circumstances modifications of speech will take place: and (if we except such variations as are purely personal, and extend no further) they are guided by the general law of change.

Prof. Mayor objects strongly to what he calls the libel that "man as a speaking animal is actuated only by laziness." I never said or thought he was. The term "laziness" hardly occurred half-a-dozen times in the book; but I fully allow that some of those passages were calculated to mislead, and I have altered them. I constantly spoke of the desire for

It is not indeed easy to say where the effect of climate may be traced. In England we see much the same weakenings as in Sanskrit. In different parts of the island we find the hard *k* sound of the Roman *castrum* either retained, or weakened to *ch* or soft *c*: we have *Caistor* and *Lancaster*, but *Manchester* and *Dorchester*, and weakest of all *Leicester* and *Gloucester*. But these varieties are less likely to be due to the effects of climate in Britain, than to the mixture of different tribes, each of which had its own phonetic laws before it left its original abode¹. Still (to return to our point) these last forms are the result of a weaker articulation; they are corruptions of the harder sound; it is not a strengthened form of one of them. Similar corruptions in English are our pronunciation of *Ocean* as *Oshan*, and *Nature* as *Nachure*, and a thousand other instances which will at once occur to every one. If the spelling in England were not in the main fixed by the standard of the literary dialect, these words would long ago have been written as they are pronounced. In countries where there is no literary dialect, or where there are several, but no one distinctly predominant, variation of spelling is the inevitable result. When writing, and still more when printing has become universal, the progress of phonetic change is considerably checked; but how much still goes on will be evident to any one who will consider the difference between the English of Chaucer and that of the present generation².

Applica-
tion of
this prin-
ciple.

Now what is the importance of the principle of phonetic change which I have stated? Its importance is this—it is our best guide in etymology. We learn from it that we must hold it a rule, never to derive a harder from

an easier sound. But a man is not necessarily lazy because he goes by an easier road instead of a hard one, or because he takes a short cut.

¹ We find “ceaster” in A.-S. to which the *ch* is often attributed. But this is not always the case. Thus our “calf” is A.-S. “cealf,” “cold” is “ceald.” Mr Skeat thinks that the softening to *ch* may be due to Norman influence.

² See the tables in A. J. Ellis' *Early English Pronunciation*, Vol. i. p. 28.

an easier sound; that a word which has retained a strong letter can only under exceptional circumstances be derived from another word which has a corresponding weaker letter. I have said above that few sounds are universally easier than others. There is no standard to fix the relative strength of all sounds available for all languages. Still there are some general rules which can be obtained by two kinds of evidence, physiological and historical. I shall describe in the fourth chapter the methods by which the different sounds are produced, and shew from their character what interchange of them is *a priori* to be expected in any given language. It will there be shewn that, for example, *k* is a stronger sound than *p*; that is, that *k* demands a larger amount of muscular exertion to produce it with the same intensity as *p*; the check is applied to the current of air issuing from the lungs at an earlier point in its course; and for this reason (with others less obvious) the sound requires more effort to pronounce. In harmony with this is the historical fact that in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic, the gutturals are found less frequently than the dentals or labials¹; and we should naturally expect those letters to be more sparingly used which required the largest amount of labour in production; they would either be not employed at all, or would pass into easier sounds, or be altogether dropped, in words in much use, like pronouns, or in suffixes where neatness and convenience were essential. Again, in many languages we find by-forms, weaker gutturals existing beside and sometimes superseding the full gutturals *k* and *g*: while we do not find similar by-forms of the labials to anything like the same extent. Accordingly from these two distinct lines of reasoning—the *a priori* road of physiology, and the more positive arguments supplied by observed facts in different languages which are not operating the one upon the other—we infer that *k* is always a stronger sound than *p* for our group of languages, and we are justi-

¹ Curtius, *Griechische Etymologie*, p. 407.

CH. I.

fied in applying that result to any language of the group. For example, in Greek we shall conclude that *κοῖος* is an older form than *ποῖος*; that *ποῖος* must be derived from *κοῖος*, not *vice versa*. So in Latin where we find side by side the words *coquina* and *popina*, we shall conclude that *popina* is a later, probably dialectical, variation of *coquina* which at an early period fell out of use at Rome, but was originally, as Varro tells us, used for a kitchen; and we shall see a possible reason for the change in the parasitic labial sound *u* which forms no part of either root or suffix, which had power to assimilate the final *c* of the \sqrt{coc} (whence *cocus*, &c.), and so turn the guttural to a labial: which in turn assimilated also the initial *c*.

Thus then the general principle of phonetic change, and the general directions which such change will take, are given by comparative philology assisted by physiology. But different peoples varied much in the extent to which they proceeded along these different paths of change. Thus the Greeks made but one variation in dealing with the original aspirates; then they stopped, and the Greek aspirates are used with as much regularity as those of the original language. The Italians on the contrary, feeling the aspirates too difficult sounds, allowed them to degrade so completely, that the single Italian spirant *f* represents not only the labial aspirate *bh*, but *dh* not unfrequently, and occasionally even *gh*. On the other hand the Greeks have thoroughly weakened the spirants *y, s, v*; the Italians retained in the main the sounds, but no special symbols. From this it is obvious that the study of Comparative Philology can never supersede the necessity of thorough investigation of each particular language for itself. Greek and Latin etymology can only be known by historical investigation of the Greek and Latin languages themselves. This investigation will shew different kinds of change sometimes peculiar to one language, sometimes common to both; it will shew regular transitions from one sound to another which (as we are justified in believing till a

better reason can be shewn) arises from the new sound being under the circumstances easier than the old. Most of the apparent exceptions will be found on examination to be less apparent examples of this law. Thus for example in Latin, and other languages, *k* changes into *g*—not *g* into *k*: yet sometimes we find *k* (Lat. *c*) change into *g* through the influence of neighbouring sounds; thus the *g* of *frag*—whence *fragor*, &c.—is hardened to *k* in *fractus*. This of course takes place because it is much harder to articulate a soft consonant and then a hard one immediately afterwards than it is to pronounce two hard together. The principle of assimilation has come in and reversed the common rule of phonetic change; but assimilation itself is an instance of the wider principle. Similarly *hiemps* would seem to be a stronger form than *hiems*: and certainly the *p* is merely 'phonetic and belongs neither to the base nor to the case-suffix *s*. But because it is very difficult to sound *s* immediately after the labial nasal *m*, in an indistinct less energetic pronunciation of the word, a weak *p* was heard, to bridge over the difficulty: and this made its way at last into the written word. But the new form though heavier is still easier to sound than the old one. Ease of pronunciation was the reason why *fragtus* became *fractus* and *hiem-s* was increased to *hiemps*, just as much as it caused the weakening, e. g. of *stlites* into *lites* and *esam* into *eram*. Sometimes we find that the general endeavour for easier pronunciation takes the form of striving after greater distinctness of sound, and so has the effect of strengthening a weaker letter. Thus the Greeks unable to pronounce *θιθημι* clearly changed the first aspirate into the stronger tenuis. But this change also is based on the fact that *τιθημι* is an easier word to pronounce than *θιθημι*. Taken by itself *τ* requires more effort to pronounce than *θ*: the check is more complete in pronouncing *τ* than in pronouncing *θ* (i. e. *t'h*, where the *h* is due to a portion of the breath being allowed to escape before

? *g wh*

CH. I.

*Different
theories
upon this
subject.*

the *t* is fully sounded)¹. But when *θ* occurs at the beginning of two consecutive syllables, a greater effort is required to place the organs of speech twice in the necessary position for producing it. All these and other apparent exceptions arising from assimilation and dissimilation of sounds, or from indistinct articulation, will be fully described in their proper places.

A different cause has been assigned for certain variations of sound by Prof. Max Müller in his valuable lectures on the Science of Language: he supposes an originally indistinct sound, capable of passing into different forms in different languages or different dialects of the same language. In the fourth lecture of his second series, he gives several examples of "phonetic degeneracy:" and he says (p. 176) that the principal cause of this is "when people attempt to economize their breath and muscular energy." But beside this cause of variation, and distinct from it, he mentions another, which he calls "Dialectic Growth" (p. 180). By this he accounts for the phonetic diversity which is seen e.g. in the Sanskrit *gharma*, Greek *θερμός*, Latin *formus*—all undoubtedly modifications of one Indo-European word meaning hot. These forms, he thinks, point to "a previous state of language, in which, as in the Polynesian dialects, the two or three principal points of consonantal contact were not yet felt as definitely separated from each other." Thus in the instance given above, the three forms were received by the three languages from some earlier stage, in which the articulation of the original word was so vague that it might take any one of the forms mentioned. This is possible, nor is the theory confuted by the *a priori* objection made to it by Prof. Curtius², that such indistinctness of sound is inconsistent with the strong articulation which peculiarly belongs to the oldest languages. But there seems to me more weight in his question, what the sound could have been which was

¹ See Ch. iv., On the Nature of Sounds.

² *Gr. Et.* p. 380, note.

capable of such strange variation. The numeral five is expressed by *panchan* in Sanskrit, *πέντε* in common Greek, *πέμπε* in Aeolic, *quinque* in Latin, *pomtis* in Oscan, *fimf* in Gothic, *penki* in Lithuanian. What can the two consonantal sounds have originally been which could be strengthened or weakened in so many ways? Prof. Müller speaks of “phonetic idiosyncrasies” in particular languages: which seems to me only another title for weaknesses of articulation become hereditary by transmission from one generation to another. But he allows¹ that “these idiosyncrasies are quite inadequate to explain why the Latin *coquo* should in Greek appear as *πέπτω*.” Professor Curtius thinks that the change from original *k* to *p* as in *πεπτω*, or from *k* to *t* as in *τῆς* (Sk. *kis*, Lat. *guis*), is to be explained by the involuntary springing up of parasitic sounds: thus that a *u* or *v* by relaxed articulation was sounded after the *k*—as it actually did spring up in the Latin, e. g. *ting-u-o* (Gr. *τέγγω*); and we may hear similar cases of relaxed articulation in England, e. g. *ne-a* for *nay*, and *ge-ate* for *gate* in Cumberland: and *fi-ound* for *found*, &c. in Suffolk—then this labial *v* by degrees corrupted the *k* to the labial *p*, and then vanished. Similarly *t* might arise from *k* by the mediation of a parasitic *y*—thus, *k*, *ky*, *ty*, *t*: the change from *k* to *t* being caused by just the same indistinct articulation which in England causes us often to hear *tloth*, and not *cloth*, and *dlory* not *glory*: though Prof. Max Müller finds it hard to believe it. These variations are of course not universal, only occasional; it is only comparatively a small number of words in which the Attic has weakened a *k*, which the Doric has retained, to *t* or *p*: similarly the Doric has suffered change in some roots as well as the Attic: $\sqrt{\text{F}\epsilon\pi}$ (orig. VAK) is “to speak” in Doric as well as in Attic. I think that the theory given above is sufficient to explain most of the cases: and thus they are all instances of a weakening tendency, gradually affecting different dialects and languages,

¹ p. 184.

and resisted by them in proportion to the firmness of their articulation; affecting for example the Doric least, the Attic considerably, the Aeolic (compare *πέμπε* and *πίσυρες*¹ with the Attic *πέντε* and *τέσσαρες*) most of all; leaving the Latin untouched, but attacking the Oscan severely².

Many apparent and some real exceptions to this principle will be found in languages which have been largely affected by the introduction of foreign words: and still more where a whole people has adopted the language of another race. Such a people retains its own peculiarities of pronunciation; it finds in the new language some sounds which are strange to it, and which it cannot pronounce: therefore it either drops them altogether, or more probably substitutes for them the nearest of its own, especially if such sounds do not occur in the strange language. Thus old sounds are lost and new ones introduced; and it is quite uncertain whether the new sound will be an easier one than the old. We have a good illus-

¹ It is not quite certain that *πίσυρες* is Aeolic: it is old Ionic.

² Dr Donaldson (*New Cratylus*, § 121) explained this difference of sound as having been produced by "the law of divergent articulations" from "the union of the original guttural and labial *kp*." I am obliged to reject this terrible combination of sounds, because I see no reason to believe that our forefathers possessed much more flexible muscles than we do. He says (*ib.* § 110) that "the regular series of transitions, which such a combination of the guttural and labial would present, may easily be described: the guttural may be represented by *k, q, g, j, s, h*, the labial by *p, b, v*; and these sets of letters may be permuted with each other to any extent." Just before he says, "in those cases where a dental makes its appearance, it must be considered as having arisen by a fault of articulation from the sibilant:" so that *t* and *d* must be added to the permutations of the guttural. This is indeed etymology made very easy!

It may perhaps be thought that in these lectures too little reference was made to the works of one of the most active and independent of English philologists. As an old pupil, I should wish to do the fullest honour to the genius, learning, and untiring energy of Dr Donaldson: as such also I cannot but regret the failures in judgment (as they seem to me) which led him either to statements like those quoted above, which would degrade etymology to the mere juggling pastime that it is sometimes held to be, and render scientific treatment of it impossible—or to the wild and groundless ethnological theories which mar the *Varronianus*. If such theories were given as mere theories, no harm would be done; but they are put on the same footing with inductions as certain as those of any science can possibly be. It is this mixture of the proven and not-proven which must make Dr Donaldson's books unfit for students of comparative philology.

tration close at home, the way in which the Keltic tendency to aspirate unaspirated sounds has affected the pronunciation of English in Ireland: e.g. car is sounded like k'har, which is nothing but a Kelto-English variation. So also in the Lowlands of Scotland along the old Keltic border line we find the initial *th* of English words dropped, just as it is regularly dropped (though written) in Gaelic speech: in Aberdeen, Angus, Moray, and North Caithness, *hw* has become *f*, through a like influence; thus "what" is sounded as "*fat*:" final *d* is not heard for a like reason¹. The full sound of the *a* is retained in Ireland, where we have weakened it in England. Here, however, something must be allowed for "the law that a transplantation of a language to a new region gives a check to its growth, and interrupts for a time its normal rate of development²." Many instances where admixture of race has operated on sound will be found in French, e.g. guêpe, guerre, &c. It is commonly supposed that guêpe is from *vespa*³, in which case the *g* must be due to the Frankish pronunciation of a Latin word, for there is no tendency in Latin to a parasitic *g* before a *w*. But it is certainly remarkable (as Max Müller has pointed out⁴) that all these French words beginning with *gu* can be traced to German words. It is better to suppose that this *gu* was the attempt of the descendants of the Romans to pronounce a German *w*, after they had let their own *w* sound become *v*, as it now is. But whichever explanation we take, we must recognise the change as resulting from the conflicting phonetic laws of two mixed peoples⁵.

¹ Murray, *Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, p. 26.

² Murray, *ib.* p. 83. He gives many interesting examples; as the Baronies of Forth and Bargo in Wexford, where some of Strongbow's followers settled in 1169 and their descendants have preserved a curiously archaic form of English. So also New England in the United States has preserved many English words which are now obsolete among us, but which were in full use at the beginning of the 17th century. See also Ellis, *E. E. P.* Vol. i. p. 20.

³ Brachet, *Fr. Grammar*, p. 64: Roby, p. 18.

⁴ *Lectures*, 2, 267.

⁵ For the history of the effect of the Teutonic on the Roman languages

CH. I.

*Erroneous
spelling
to suit
supposed
etymolo-
gies.*

It is well known that from this operation of a double set of phonetic laws the same word may exist in two forms in the same language: as in English "crab" and "cray-fish," the latter being the French écrevisse from German krebiz, krebs¹. The etymological tendency exhibited in "cray-fish" is the last point which I wish to consider in this chapter. The French form being strange to the English ear, it was converted into something which would convey a meaning. We have here nothing but a highly irregular application of the striving for distinctness which I have already mentioned as acting counter to ordinary phonetic change; I say, irregular, because it is impossible to predict in what way it may act. A great number of instances may be found in Cumberland where a Norse colony settled, probably in the latter half of the tenth century, and introduced words which in after time had a strange sound, and were identified with whatever English word they resembled. Thus "foss," a waterfall (as in Norway at the present day), was confused with "force" (*fortis*), and so we get Scale Force, &c.: the proper names Koli and Mioll are disguised in Coal Gill and Mill How, and the compound name Toli-Wagen has given us Dolly Waggon Pike upon Helvellyn².

The results of this principle of change are very numerous in composite languages like the English. I do not however imagine that it operated much on the Greek and Latin languages. Greek, in the stage at which we know it, could have little admixture which is not manifest at the first glance: and the Latin was not much more affected. In pure languages, I conclude (in spite of a few real and some apparent exceptions), phonetic change has a downward tendency; it causes in general weakening of the language, even though that weakening may be use-

see Diez, *Introduction to the Grammar of the Romance Languages*, trans. Cayley, p. 60.

¹ *Ib.* p. 68.

² See Ferguson, *Northmen in Cumberland*, for these and many other etymologies.

fully employed. What then was the original, of which the Greek and Latin are copies, weakened each in its own peculiar way? This will be the subject of the next Chapter.

NOTE TO CHAPTER I.

ON THE DERIVATION OF LATIN WORDS FROM GREEK.

The facts are so very simple, yet there is so much misconception about them, that it seems worth while to say a word on the supposed derivation of Latin words from Greek. This theory is probably to be attributed to Niebuhr's hypothesis of a Greek and non-Greek element in the Latin language, which made its way into English works without much examination through the influence of Niebuhr's extraordinary genius; but which has been completely overthrown by Comparative Philology. The apparently Greek element in the Latin language is (generally speaking) that part of the common inheritance of the Greeks and Italians, which each nation retained and developed after the separation of the two branches of the original stock¹. The apparently non-Greek element is that portion of the common inheritance which was neglected by the Greeks—or, if retained by provincial and obscure dialects, was disused by those which possessed a literature; which therefore in process of time seemed to be—to some extent actually was—peculiar to the Italians. The community of terms denoting peaceful occupations and the difference of warlike terms, which Niebuhr notes, only shew that the science of war had not been developed by the Graeco-Italian people.

What then are we to say of words like *lyra*, &c.? Are not these derived from the Greek? Certainly not *derived*. No Latin word is derived from the Greek in the proper sense of the term. The Latin *borrowed* words fully formed from the Greek, which it spelt on different principles according to the

¹ See this more developed in Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, II. 41, &c.

different times at which they become nationalised. At the earliest period at which such borrowed words occur, we find them spelt with such Latin characters as most nearly represented those Greek sounds which had either been developed by the Greek after the parting of the two peoples, or which had been lost by the Latins out of the original common stock. Thus the Greek aspirates—peculiar developments of the Greek—appeared in Latin as unaspirated mutes; e.g. *Aciles* (Ἀχιλλεύς), *Bruges* (Φρύγες); this last word shews moreover that the full Latin *u* was taken as the nearest Latin exponent of the Greek *upsilon* (a modified *u*), and in Plautus *ss* appears as the best representative of the strong Greek ζ (which differed from the old weak Italian *z*) in *badisso*, *tarpessita*, &c. In the Augustan age, on the contrary, Greek characters are borrowed as well as the sounds, the *Υ* in *lyra*, the *Z* in *zona*, &c.: while a combination of letters represented the complex sound of the Greek aspirates—*chorδα*, *philosophia*, &c. Now it is obvious that these words were not *derived* from the Greek; they were not formed from a Greek root by adding to it a Latin suffix; they were derived in Greece from Greek roots by Greek suffixes and transplanted when fully grown into Latin. They are as foreign to the Latin language and its development, as the men and things they represent were foreign to Rome. But from these borrowed Greek words it was inferred by a false analogy that numbers of genuine Latin words were borrowed from the Greek. Because *lyra* was the Greek λύρα, it was supposed that *lacruma* was the Greek δάκρυμα; and consequently it was written *lacryma*, or even by some curious fatality *lachryma*. But in truth the words have nothing in common except their base *dakr* (whence the A.-S. *teagor*, our “tear”); each was formed from that base, but by its own suffix in its own land: the emotional Italian was not likely to lack a word for a tear, till he had borrowed it from the Greek! In other cases—e.g. the Latin *silva*, no doubt the noun SVLVĀ existed in Graeco-Italian days, and was then modified by the two peoples in different ways according to their different phonetic laws. But it is an entire mistake to write *silva* with *y*, that is, to imply that the word was borrowed from the Greek ἵλη. Indeed the Latin has kept the old form more nearly than the Greek; it has changed *u* to *i*, and *ā*

to *ā*, both regular Latin changes, and both weakenings; but *ῥλῥ* exhibits no less than four weakenings; *s* has passed into the rough breathing; *u* has (as always in Greek) been weakened to *upsilon*; *v* has passed out altogether, and *ā* has been thinned to *η*.

The rule then to follow in writing Latin is very simple: we must use the letters *Y, Z*, and the compounds *CH, TH, PH*, in words borrowed from the Greek and in no others. Such words are not difficult to recognise. They are mostly words relating to the arts and sciences which the Romans borrowed from the Greeks. All other words are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, genuine Latin, and should be written in the Latin character. The only exception which should be allowed is in cases where we have express testimony that Roman writers in the last century of the Republic employed Greek characters—or the equivalent compounds in Latin—in words which are beyond doubt genuinely Latin, but which by a mistaken analogy were then supposed to be derived from the Greek. In such cases we may write, e.g. *pulcher*¹—though we believe it to be etymologically wrong—on the same principle that we write, e.g. *caussa*, and *querella*; because they represent the spelling which, rightly or wrongly, was in use in Cicero's day among educated men; not because we believe it to be the Greek *πολύχρως*². Lucretius truly says, "*Utilitas expressit nomina rerum*;" and it is equally true that use must always be the standard of orthography, and must override etymological considerations. Only let our standard in Latin be the usage of Cicero's time, not of the period of the Renaissance.

¹ See Cic. *Orat.* c. 48. § 160.

² It is possible however the *h* in this and similar words, *Cethegus*, *Carthago*, &c., may have nothing to do with the Greek, but may be a vulgar use of the aspirate which was passing into the literary language in Cicero's day. His phrase "*usum loquendi populo concessi*" rather supports this view. See additional evidence in the section on "*Aspiration*" in the last chapter of this book, and Roscher, *de Aspiratione apud Romanos* in Curtius, *Studien*, II. 2. 143, &c.

CHAPTER II.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN PEOPLES.

CH. II.

Classifica-
tion of the
Indo-
European
peoples.

(i.) *Aryan*
or *Asiatic*.

I TRANSLATE from Schleicher¹ the very brief and clear account of the main divisions and subdivisions of the variously called Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, or Aryan language : to which can be traced nearly all the languages of Europe², and two at least of those of Asia, the Sanskrit and the Zend.

"The name of Indo-Germanic has been given to a certain class of the languages of the Asiatic-European portion of the earth, which are so accordant with each other, and which differ so much from all other languages in their nature, that they clearly shew themselves to have sprung from a common original language. Within this Indo-Germanic family of languages, some, which are more closely geographically connected, shew themselves certainly to be the most nearly allied, so that the Indo-Germanic family divides into three groups or divisions. These are—

"I. The Aryan³ division, consisting of the *Indian* and *Iranian*, or more correctly *Erastian*, families of languages, which are very closely related to each other.

"The oldest representative and original language of the Indian family, and the oldest⁴ known language of the

¹ *Compendium der Vergleichenden Grammatik*, pp. 6—8.

² See note at the end of the chapter.

³ It will be seen that the term Aryan is here applied only to the two Asiatic peoples who can be certainly proved to have called themselves by that name.

⁴ Prof. Schleicher of course does not mean that the Sanskrit existed before the Greek and Latin, but that it is known to us in an older stage than any other. The error which arises from regarding every Sanskrit form as older than the corresponding forms in Greek and Latin will be noticed at p. 34.

Indo-Germanic tongue altogether, is the old Indian, the language of the oldest portion of the Vedas; at a later time in a simpler form and as a grammatical literary language, contrasted with the popular dialects, named *Sanskrit*.

"We do not know *Erastian* in its original form; the oldest Erastian languages which have reached us are the old Bactrian or *Zend* (the eastern), and the old Persian, the language of the Achaemenidean cuneiform inscriptions (the western). To this family belongs also the Armenian, which we first know at a later time, and which must have separated earlier from the Erastian original language.

"II. The south-western European portion consisting of (1) the *Greek*, nearest to which stands a language only known in its modern form, the *Albanian*: (2) the *Italian*; the oldest known forms of this family are the *Latin*,—and especially important for us is the old Latin, as it was spoken before the introduction of the educated literary language moulded by Greek influence,—the *Umbrian*, and the *Oscan*: (3) the *Keltic*: the best preserved, but still very decomposed, language of the Keltic family is the *Old Irish*, reaching from the seventh century of our era.

(ii.) *South European.*

"III. The northern European portion, consisting of the *Slavonic* family, with the closely allied *Lithuanian* (which is for us the important language among this group); and the *Teutonic*, which is widely sundered from both.

(iii.) *North European.*

"The oldest forms of language in this portion are the *Old Bulgarian*—old Ecclesiastical Slavonic in MS., dating up to the eleventh century: the *Lithuanian*—first brought under our notice three hundred years ago, but clearly of much higher antiquity—and the *Gothic*, of the fourth century. Near to the Gothic, however, are the most ancient representatives of the German and the Norse, the Old High-German and Old Norse, to be brought forward where they present older forms than the Gothic.

"It is in the Asiatic division that is contained most that is ancient in the sounds and in the fabric of language, and

CH. II.

here again especially in the *Old Indian*. Then follows with reference to antiquity—that is to say, in the retaining its similarity to the original language, in having fewer strongly developed individual forms—the southern European division, in which the Greek had remained closest to the original; finally, the northern European group, which, taken as a whole, presents itself as developed with the most individuality, and in which the least remains of the original speech are to be traced.

Their degrees of relationship.


“If we combine this statement with the relationship already described of the Indo-Germanic languages among themselves, and draw from the two our conclusion as to the process of the divisions of the main body of Indo-Germanic speech in the earliest times, we arrive at the following results: The Indo-Germanic original speech divided itself, first, by the unequal development in different parts of the province, into two sections: it divided off from itself the *Sclavo-Teutonic*, the language which afterwards divided into Teutonic and Sclavo-Lithuanian: and later, that portion of the original speech which remained, the *Aryo-Graeco-Italo-Keltic*, divided itself into Graeco-Italo-Keltic and Aryan, of which the first-named soon divided itself into Greek and Italo-Keltic: and the latter, the Aryan, remained undivided for a considerable time.

“At a later period the Sclavo-Lithuanian, the Aryan (Indo-Eranian), and Italo-Keltic further divided themselves. It is possible that at some or all of the divisions more languages arose than are now manifest, as in many instances in process of time Indo-Germanic languages have probably become extinct. The more towards the East an Indo-Germanic people lives, so much more of what is ancient has their language retained. The more towards the west they have gone, so much the less of what is old, and so many more new formations are to be found in their language. From these and other intimations we may conclude that the Sclavo-Teutonic race first began their

journeyings towards the west: then followed the Graeco-Italo-Keltic: of the Aryans who remained behind, the Indians travelled south-eastward, and the Eranians spread in a south-westerly direction. The home of the original Indo-Germanic race is to be sought in the central highlands of Asia.

"It is only of the Indians, who were the last to separate from the parent stem, that we can say with any certainty that they drove out an aboriginal people from their later dwelling-place, much of whose language passed into their own; of many of the other Indo-Germanic peoples such an hypothesis is highly probable."

Prof. Schleicher proceeds to shew the degrees of relationship of the main families of the Indo-Germanic speech by the diagram given below; in which the length of the lines indicates the probable time of separation.



I have given Schleicher's words as a concise and clear statement of the relationship of the different peoples of the common stock. But in some points it is open to dispute. For example, a theory is gaining ground that the North European family was not the first to leave the

Fick's doctrine of European unity.

common stock : that there was a common European family which subsisted together for a considerable period after the separation from the Asiatic stock, presumably in central Europe, whence it afterwards parted north and south. This doctrine has been maintained by Fick¹. The force of his arguments will hardly be understood here ; but briefly stated they are—

(1) the non-existence of the letter *l* in the Asiatic division before its separation into Sanskrit and Zend, for this letter is not found in Zend : he concludes that the letter was developed by the European family in common, and afterwards by the Sanskrit alone : evidence for this will appear in the history of *l*, in Chapter V. ;

(2) the great corruption of the gutturals in Asia, contrasted with their firmness in the European languages ;

(3) the difference in the ground-form of many words in the European contrasted with the Asiatic vocabulary, and the development of a large number of words common to Europe, but not found in Asia ; against this must of course be set a similar but smaller list of words common to Asia and South Europe, but strange to North Europe ;

(4) the absence of agricultural terms common to Asia and Europe ; on this see Mommsen's *History of Rome*, ch. ii. ;

(5) the common European development of the vowel *e*, which points very strongly to a lengthened time in which the whole European race lived together.

Of these the first and fifth argument seem to me the most important, and on the whole to make out a stronger case than Schleicher's. If then this view be adopted, the diagram must be modified to correspond to it.

Schleicher's view of the near connection of the Keltic with the Italian also is disputable. I may briefly give here some of the principal arguments on both sides,

Connection
between
the Latin
and Keltic
as given by
Schleicher.

¹ See his *Wörterbuch*, p. 1045, and his late treatise, which is specially devoted to this point, *Die ehemalige Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europas*.

though their force will not be seen without some knowledge of the phonetic laws described in the following chapters. Schleicher believes in a "Graeco-Italo-Keltisch" period: in which the ancestors of those peoples divided the *a* sound into *a*, *e*, *o*, after parting from the Teutonic race, or at least the Gothic division of it. Then the Greeks parted off, and an Italo-Keltic period followed, distinguished by the loss of aspirates and retention of spirants, and notably also by the loss of the old middle voice and the formation of a quite new form peculiar to the Italians and the Kelts: compare *legitur*, Keltic *legthar*, with *λέγεται*. After their final separation the Kelts lost the ablative and the reduplicated perfect, losses which distinguish Keltic from Italian. Other points of agreement between the Keltic and Italian, not found between any other two languages, are the formative suffix *-tion* (*-sion*), and perhaps *-tric*; the dative plural in *b*, *fratribus*, *braithrib*, while all the North European languages have *m*, e.g. Gothic *brōthrum*, the termination *i* alike for the genitive singular and nominative plural of the *a*-stem, and the future suffix *-bo*, *-bis*, &c., for which forms in *b* and *f* appear in old Irish. Lottner and Ebel, on the other hand, connect the Keltic with the North European languages¹. They argue from the agreement of diphthongs (*ai*, *oi*, *au*, *iu*, in Keltic, *ai*, *ei*, *au*, *iu*, in Teutonic, four in each language, while the Graeco-Italians certainly had six, *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, *au*, *eu*, *ou*): and from the different origin of some consonants; thus the Kymric² *ch* is from *h*, a substitute for *s*, the Gaelic *f* is a hardened *v*, the Kymric *f*, according to Ebel, is derived from *s*, except where it occurs in words

Counter-arguments of Ebel.

¹ Ebel's arguments may be seen in *Keltische Studien* (Engl. trans., pp. 119—132). See also Schleicher's *Kurzer Abriss der Gesch. der Ital. Sprachen* in the *Rheinisches Museum* for 1859, and Ebel in Kuhn and Schleicher's *Beiträge*, i. 429.

² Keltic comprises the *Kymric* or Welsh, the now extinct *Cornish*, and the *Armorican*, or ancient language of Brittany: these three are nearly related, and are sometimes all included under the name *Kymric*. More distinct are the *Erse* or old Irish, the *Gaelic* of the Highlands, and the *Manx*: these are all sometimes called *Gadhelic*.

CH. II.

Nature of
the argu-
ments.

certainly borrowed from the Latin; on the other hand the Latin *h* and *f* come from aspirates, not from other spirants. Some agreements in inflexion between the Keltic and Lithuanian are not nearly so convincing as Schleicher's which are given above. Lastly, Ebel sees "a pervading analogy in the Slavonian, Teutonic, and both branches of the Keltic¹," evidenced, for instance, by the employment of prefixes to express completed action, instead of reduplication, as in Graeco-Italian; such prefixes are *ru* or *ro* in Keltic, *ga* in Gothic, the modern German *ge*, both of which have this force, though also some others.

The arguments on both sides, it will be observed, are confined to the forms and inflexions of words: they are not drawn from the common possession (which is indubitable) of very many words by the Latin and Keltic, especially the Kymric. The reason is that it is generally impossible to distinguish between the genuinely Keltic words and those which were only borrowed from the Latin after the Romans came into contact with the Kelts. When we find words like *fin* and *flam*, occurring only in Kymric and Armorican, there can be no doubt that we have here *finis* and *flamma* borrowed. But when we find words like "traeth," a sandy flat, occurring in Kymric, and in slightly different forms in Cornish, Armorican, Irish, and Gaelic, it seems unlikely that each of these races, which were probably separate before the Romans came into contact with them, either independently borrowed the Latin "tractus," or passed it on from one to another. Still Ebel's list of borrowed words (in which *traeth* occurs) cannot often be challenged, and it is incomparably larger than that of words which are peculiar to the Latin and Keltic, and not shared by the North Europeans. We are therefore forced back upon the arguments from forms given above. Now such arguments are, generally speaking, stronger than any mere agreement of words. But in this case they lose much of their usual force from the obviously late character

¹ *Celtic Studies*, p. 128.

of a great part of Keltic grammar. Thus the personal suffixes of the Welsh verbs have hardly anything in common with the Irish; they are clearly new Kymric developments, while the Irish has preserved the older forms. Similar novelties occur in every division of Keltic grammar, the Irish included. All that we can therefore say is, that we cannot expect, under the circumstances, to find greater analogies than those which Schleicher has pointed out: they are not conclusive, but they are all that can be had. I think his case here is stronger than that of his opponents¹.

The Hellenic subdivisions:

i. *Doric, hard and soft;*

It may be useful to sketch very briefly the divisions of the Hellenic speech. The divisions of the Italian race (as proved by linguistic research, not mere tradition) are given by Mommsen, in his *History of Rome*. The old threefold division of the Hellenes into Dorians, Aeolians, and Ionians, requires further subdivision.

The grammarians early recognised two forms of Doric: one the harder or more severe, spoken by the Laconians, the islanders of Crete, in Cyrene, and in the Greek cities of Italy: the other softer, called *ἀνειμένη καὶ χθαμαλή Δωρίς* by a scholiast on Theokritus, which was commonly used by that writer (though, at least as we have the text, with many forms of the severe Doric intermixed), as by Epicharmus and Sophron before him, and by the Sicilians in general, and the Dorians of Messene, Argolis, and Megara, and Greece proper, and the islands near Asia Minor. The hard Doric has most peculiarities in common with the Aeolic, the soft Doric with the Ionic: but to this general statement there are a good many exceptions, which will appear hereafter. Time also brought the hard Doric into greater conformity with the soft: this transition varied of course with the circumstances of the speakers: thus the isolated people of Cyrene, in the second century B.C., retained forms which were falling out elsewhere in the fourth. It may be added that the *πλατειασμός*, commonly

¹ I ought to say that I am unfortunately not a Keltic scholar.

CH. II.

supposed to distinguish all Doric¹, was certainly not peculiar to the Dorians, but shared by them with nearly all the Aeolic race.

ii. Aeolic;

(1) Lesbian,

(2) Boeotian,

(3) Thessalian;

The most important subdivisions of the Aeolic speech are the Lesbian, or Aeolic of Asia Minor, the Thessalian, and the Boeotian: probably the Arcadian and the Elean should be added. The Lesbian is principally known to us by inscriptions, and by the fragments of Alkæus and Sappho: the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth idylls of Theokritus are also Lesbian, and have been excellently restored by Ahrens. A peculiarity of this dialect is the extensive throwing back of the accent; also a rather greater loss of the rough breathing. The symbol of the digamma was retained longer than by the Ionians, but not so long as by the Boeotians, or by the Italian Dorians: the sound was passing out in Asia Minor about the same time. The Lesbian and Boeotian are principally marked as members of one head-dialect by their strong tendency to assimilation of consonants—of the nasals, liquids, and sibilants in Lesbian, and of the dentals in Boeotian; and by the tendency to weaken an original *a* sound to *o* and *u* in the Lesbian, to *i* in the Boeotian; this identity of principle, but difference of practice, is just what might be expected from kindred tribes separated widely in abode. The Boeotian is known to us principally by inscriptions and by the fragments of Corinna. The Thessalian (which is known by very few inscriptions) appears to combine their peculiarities: it doubles both liquids and dentals, and it weakens *a* into *o*, with the Lesbian, while in some minor vowel changes it agrees with the Boeotian. It thus serves as a connecting link between the two, and vindicates their title to a community of origin more recent than the first separate existence of the Hellenic stock. The last writer on the subject, Gelbke², supposes that Thessaly was their

¹ Compare Theok. xv. 88; see however the discussion upon the sound of the *a* at the end of § 1 of Chapter VII.

² *De dialecto Arcadica* in Curtius, *Studien*, Vol. II. Part 2.

common seat, whence one division passed either by land, or by the islands over the sea to Asia, another to Boeotia, and, if his theory be true, also to the Peloponnesus: for he includes among the Aeolic the Arcadian and Elean dialects, which Ahrens¹ believes to be Doric. Gelbke has the additional evidence of a Tegeatic inscription, and he makes the balance lean to the Aeolic side, though the proof cannot be called conclusive². He places the Arcadian, together with the Lesbian, as inclining towards the Ionic: and he adds the Cypriote; the old legend of the colonisation of Cyprus by Arcadians, on the return from Troy, is supported by linguistic facts. The Eleans, on the other side, he connects rather with the Boeotians, whose language undoubtedly comes nearest to the Doric. It is remarkable that the Cypriote was written in at least semi-cuneiform characters, each of which stood for a syllable, not a single sound. It has not yet been proved to be (as all the other alphabets of Europe are) of Phoenician origin: and there seems no evidence for Lenormant's suggestion³, that it is the remnant of a system once common to the coasts of Asia Minor, and found mixed up with Greek symbols, in the Lycian and Carian alphabets.

The account commonly given of the Ionic, that it is divided into three periods, the early, that of Homer; the middle, that of Herodotus; and the third, the Attic—is not satisfactory. The Attic is certainly not a development of the Ionic of Herodotus: in many respects, e.g. in still preserving the original *a* after *ρ*, where the Ionic has allowed it to pass into *η*, it represents an older form. The vowel variations in Herodotus are not easy to reduce to principle. Generally *a* has passed into *η*: yet sometimes

iii. Ionic;

difference
of Ionic
and Attic,

¹ *De dialectis Graecis*, i. 225. The above sketch is principally taken from this most valuable work, which, though published more than thirty years ago, is still the best on the subject.

² It consists chiefly of certain vowel changes: the Arcadians have the peculiar *υ* of the Lesbians, e.g. Lesb. ἀρύ, Arcadian καρύ; a number of words where *ο* occurs πόρονψ, κόρφα (i.e. καρδια), &c., and many other minute points.

³ *Essai sur la propagation de l'Alphabet Phénicien*, p. 106, note.

CH. II.

the α is retained (as in $\chi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) where the Attic has allowed the change. In the peculiar form $\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\omega\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Attic $\acute{\omicron}\rho\rho\omega\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$) there can be little doubt that α (followed by a double ρ) does not represent the full α -sound. Generally, a single vowel sound is preferred to a diphthong, as $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$, $\acute{\omega}\nu$ ($\omicron\upsilon\nu$), $\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\gamma\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$, &c.; but there are not many examples of each of these variations; while almost universally ϵ is retained when it is the first member of a diphthong, (as in $\epsilon\alpha$, $\epsilon\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\epsilon\iota$, $\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, $\epsilon\omega$), where the Attic absorbs it. The vocalization of ν is obviously an Ionic weakening; as in $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\alpha\tau\omicron$; generally accompanied by change of a preceding vowel, as in $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\eta}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\omicron$. The older forms are remarkably preserved in some of the declensions, especially the i -class, where we find e.g. $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota$ (for $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota-\iota$), $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\nu$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\epsilon\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\omega\nu$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\varsigma\iota$, $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma$ or $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\varsigma$. Generally, however, the vowels have changed more in the Herodotean Ionic: but in the cases (few in all) where we find different consonants in Attic and Ionic, the latter has the oldest sound. The connection of the two is extremely close, more close than the Aeolic of Boeotia and the Aeolic of Asia: probably in the main the Attic has preserved very closely the language spoken at the time of the separation, influenced to some extent by neighbouring dialects; while the Ionic changed more, chiefly to softer sounds, which may possibly be the result of the more luxurious life of Ephesus and Miletus. The older Ionic, which is supposed to be represented by Homer, is delusive. Mr Paley, in his introduction to the *Iliad*, has maintained that the Homeric poems, in their present form, have no claim to their supposed age; but that they were combined at a late date from a very much larger stock of pre-existent materials. This conclusion is supported by the language of the poems: the forms of the words bear the impress of a school of poets who were writing in a language not that spoken in their day, but one containing many archaic forms, and many others

supposed
old Ionic.

formed on their model which were probably never used at all in actual life. This has been clearly pointed out by Curtius¹; and "it is certain," as he says, "that this dialect is the production of a conventional minstrel-usage, which preserved a number of very old forms and sounds regarded as in process of extinction; but at the same time availed itself of many formations of later date, and evidently in contemporary use." It is clear then that, though we may find many old forms here, we find no genuine old Ionic dialect².

Gelbke's hypothesis that the Asiatic Aeoles passed from Thessaly to Asia Minor is not inconsistent with that of Prof. E. Curtius, who, in his recent *History of Greece*, reverses the account commonly given of the Ionians, and makes the Asiatic settlements the oldest; from these brings the inhabitants of Attica across by the islands, while the Dorians came by the northern mainland. These may have passed by the Aeoles while they were still in

¹ In his *Erläuterungen*, p. 46, Eng. trans. The proof is too long to give here: but instances will be given in a later chapter.

² On the other hand it must be said that the Homeric syntax speaks strongly for the antiquity of the poems, though not necessarily for their origin as single and complete works of one writer. Its chief characteristic is its exceeding and unnecessary fulness. It bears all the marks of being the product of an age absolutely unfettered by grammatical rule, when formal syntax was unknown: and the writers employed in their full freedom the boundless resources of the language: they did not use them irregularly, because there was no restriction. In subsequent generations this unnecessary luxuriance was pruned: enough was left in Attic Greek to express the nicest distinctions of thought: but variations from rule appear, such as the use of *δς* and *ει* with the subjunctive, the optative without *ἄν* in the direct statement (*Coeeph.* 594, *Antig.* 605, sometimes needlessly altered) the use of *οὐ μὴ* with the other persons of the future and the subjunctive, (e.g. *Æd. Col.* 176, *Elect.* 1052 and 1029), as well as the three usual in Attic, and others like these; which would be inconceivable except as lingering reminiscences of an older usage, in no way incorrect but needlessly abundant. It becomes therefore necessary to reconcile the want of genuineness in the forms of words (mentioned in the text) with the age which the syntax demands. It is only possible to do so by postulating a very great age for the poems in their separate form (out of which I believe the *Iliad* at least to have been constructed), in order to allow time for the formation of a conventional minstrel dialect in a period not later than that of undeveloped syntax. Those who maintain the unity of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* must allow that they were composed at the very end of such a period.

CH. II.

their original abode: then the retrograde Aeolic movement into Asia may have been by the mainland, or possibly by the islands.

I now return to the primitive people; to which I prefer to give the rather superseded title Indo-European. I prefer it to the name Aryan, rendered popular by Prof. Max Müller's most suggestive lectures, because I think that there is no sufficient evidence that that name was ever adopted by any other than the Asiatic branch of the family. The tracing by Prof. Max Müller¹ of "the ancient name of Arya from India to Ireland" seems, to say the least, very uncertain: and the connection of the word *ārya* with the root found in *arare*² is unlikely. Surely the simplest way is to connect it with the widely extended \sqrt{AR} , to fit: whence the derivative might get the successive meanings of fitting, worthy, noble; a sequence of meaning very similar to that of the Sanskrit *sat*, originally (*a*)*sa*(*n*)*t*, the present participle of *AS*, to be, which signifies first being, then "actually existing," "true," "good." Why should not the Eastern family of the Indo-European race—the ancestors of the Hindus and of the Persians—have called themselves "the noble" in opposition to the indigenous tribes whom they subjugated, just as the old Greek nobles called themselves the *ἑσθλοί* and *ἀγαθοί*, and the Roman conservatives styled themselves the "boni"? The evidence of names like Ariovistus, and the very dubious Erin and Ireland, is too slight to warrant us in supposing that the use of the term *ārya* in its derived sense is older than the time when the Hindus and Persians remained together as one people after the separation of the Eastern and Western branches.

The readiness with which the name Aryan has been accepted as the designation of the entire family, might almost seem to be a trace of the erroneous belief till late almost universal—a belief of course not shared by Prof. Max Müller—that Sanskrit existed at an earlier period

¹ Lectures, Series I. p 236.

² *Id.* p. 226.

Is the original people properly called Aryan?

Importance sometimes given erroneously to Sanskrit.

than its sisters : and by consequence that every form found in Sanskrit must represent the primitive form more nearly than any other, if indeed it be not the primitive form itself. This error was indeed a natural one ; it arose from the fact that our records of Sanskrit speech stretch back to a much earlier time than those of any of the sister languages, and still more from the peculiar character of the language. Compared with Greek and Latin, Sanskrit may be said to have no syntax. Long sentences are expressed by enormous compounds, sometimes extending over many lines, consisting generally of bases¹, of which the last only is inflected. By these the syntactic relations of other languages are given with considerable ease, though without much precision. This habit, however, made it necessary for the Hindus to keep the formative part of their grammar excessively clear ; to keep roots and suffixes, all the formative machinery, unconfused in order that they might be compounded as need arose. Consequently it was found that Sanskrit words could be dissected with an ease unknown in Greek and Latin : older forms were brought to light which were just traceable in their corrupted state in those languages in which root and suffix have run into one. Much in them was therefore clearly shewn to be secondary and derived : and it was not unnaturally thought sometimes that Sanskrit was the primitive speech of the race. Still, very little consideration will shew that it does not necessarily follow from this that Sanskrit must in every case present to us the oldest form of verb or noun, of derivative or inflective suffix. As a matter of fact, there is hardly any language—not even the most corrupted of modern tongues—which does not occasionally shew us a more antique form than the Sanskrit. Thus the Greek

¹ Sometimes, but rarely, a case is used instead of a base : e.g. *param-tapa*, i.e. *param-tapa* = *hostem-ueuator*. Similar examples occur in Latin, e.g. *iuris-consultus*, beside the more regular *opi-parus*, *uiti-sator*, &c. So also in Greek we have *ὀρεσι-τροφος*, *Ναυσι-θοος* ; contrast *ναύ-λοχος*, &c. Compounds formed with bases, as in Sanskrit, are by far the most usual.

CH. II.

Necessary
cautions.

ἀ-στερ- (where the *a* is phonetic), the Latin *stella* (for *ster-ula*); the Gothic *stair-nô*, German *stern*, and Dutch *ster*, can leave no doubt on our mind that our own “star” represents more faithfully the name by which our fathers knew the “scatterers of light,” than the corrupted Sanskrit *târa*, where the *s* has been lost by relaxed articulation: whilst the identity of the Sanskrit word with the more perfect form preserved by the sister languages is evidenced by the Vedic *staras*. In fact Sanskrit, eminently conservative as it was of derivative and inflectional forms, can shew at least as large a list of weakenings of particular letters or groups of letters as any Western language¹. The primitive form in every case is to be discovered only by tracing the word up through all the main divisions of the original speech in which it occurs. To do this requires care, acuteness, and knowledge of the special phonetic laws of each language. Neither similarity of sound, nor identity of meaning, alone is sufficient to prove the identity of similar words in different languages. Nay, there are cases where identity of sound is an almost certain proof that the words must be of different origin; had they sprung from the same word they must in obedience to ascertained phonetic laws have taken *different* forms in different languages. Thus no one doubts that the English “kin” (Goth. *kuni*) is the same word as the Greek γένος. But if our English word had begun with *g* and not with *k*, we should have known the two words though identical in sound must have been of different origin: because in accordance with the ascertained sequence of sound—known by the name of Grimm’s law—*k*, and not *g*, is the letter which in Low German corresponds to γ in the same Greek word. Correspondence then of sound, according to known rules—not necessarily identity—must be insisted upon as necessary for certainty

¹ So also many English words are older than the corresponding Greek form: “work” is older than ἔργον, where the *w* has been dropped; as Mr. Cockayne rightly points out in his amusing work *Spoon and Sparrow* p. 8; where however not all things are right.

in etymology, as well as identity of meaning. In obedience to this canon we must reject many etymologies which might otherwise seem most certain. Thus probably few would hesitate to identify at first sight the Roman *deus* with the Greek *θεός*. But in words derived by the two languages from a common source, an initial *d* in Latin has regularly *δ* corresponding to it in the Greek; as *domus*, *δῶμος*, &c. There is no probable instance of the aspiration, within the Greek language, of an initial unaspirated letter: though sometimes a medial letter is aspirated generally through the influence of an adjoining nasal or sibilant. The two words therefore must be kept distinct. *Deus* no doubt is to be referred together with the Sanskrit *deva* to the Indo-Eur. root *DIV*, to shine; which occurs also in Greek in *διος* (i. e. *διF-yo-s*), which in Homer is always used with clear reference to its primary sense, as bright, fair, goodly: thus *δία θεάων* certainly expresses no special divinity, but means "the goddess fair," just as *δία γυναικῶν* is a fair woman: and it is noteworthy that *θεῖος* also occurs in Homer and means divine, though it sometimes sinks to the sense of God-like, eminent, distinguished, and so hardly differs from *διος*. The occurrence of *διος* in Greek shews clearly enough that there was no exceptional tendency to aspirate this particular initial *δ*. Some other origin must be sought for *θεός*; perhaps $\sqrt{\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$ a secondary form of $\sqrt{\theta\epsilon}$ the root of *τίθημι*; though this is rejected by Prof. Curtius¹ in favour of a distinct $\sqrt{\theta\epsilon\varsigma}$ "to pray," corresponding, as he thinks, to a Latin \sqrt{fes} in *festus*, &c., from which would be derived the curious word *θέσσαυτο* in Pindar². But, be the derivation of *θεός* what it may, the severance of it from *deus*³ is a fair example of the

¹ *Gr. Et.* p. 230 ed. 2, and 471 ed. 3,

² *Nem.* v. 10,

³ I find that the sundering of *deus* and *θεός* has been regarded as a hard saying. I am not convinced however by any arguments which have been brought forward in favour of their identity. A writer in the *Saturday Review* thinks that the occurrence of *ἄθεος* and of *adeva* in Sanskrit proves the identity of *deva* and *θεός*. But why should not the compounds have been formed separately, each in its own language? I do

rigorous observance of phonetic laws which the science of Comparative Philology demands when properly pursued.

But we must return to our immediate object. We do not now want by comparison of different languages to discover the original forms of the words we find there in their endless modifications. We want to know what those phonetic laws are which have modified the development of Greek and Latin. We must therefore assume the main results of Comparative Philology. We must accept the forms discovered by manifold comparison; and then see how the Greek and Latin forms have varied from them.

Specimens of roots and actual words occurring in the Indo-European language will be given in the fifth chapter: they will be selected so as to throw some light on the stage of development, both intellectual and social, which our ancestors had reached before their separation. In the mean time it will be well to discuss first, the nature of the roots and suffixes we have to deal with; and, secondly, the nature of the original sounds, which will involve for the sake of clearness and completeness the consideration of many which were certainly not original. These two subjects will be discussed in the two following chapters.

not think that *d̥heos* occurs early in Greek. The argument assumes that if we find in cognate languages compound words with the same meaning, the parts also of the compounds must necessarily correspond. But no one will maintain this. Because *d̥dikos*=*iniustus*, and *a*=*in*, is *d̥iko*-then=*iusto*? The greater similarity of sound between *theo*- and *deva* is only accidental.

Prof. Jos. B. Mayor (*Camb. Jour.* l. c. p. 343) argues from the fact that medial *d* can correspond to *θ*, which proves nothing, and gives for an example *at̥w*=*aedes*, forgetting that here *θ*=original *dh* and is perfectly regular. He proceeds to argue from the change in *ab-dere*, *con-dere* &c., where the root is *dhā*, forgetting that the difficulty he has to account for is the change of original *p* into *θ*, not of original *dh* into *d*. And if the argument were applicable at all, it would be conclusive on the other side; the root *dhā* is only found in Latin in composition, that is to say, this *d* is only medial.

NOTE.—The languages in Europe which are not Indo-European are those of the Finns, Esths, and Lapps, in the North, the scattered tribes of the Volga, the Voguls, and the Ostiaks, the Hungarians (the affinity of whose language to the Finnic was long ago suspected, but only proved seventy years ago, see M. Müller, *Survey of Languages*, pp. 99—119), the Turks (whose language, Turanian in its basis, is largely intermixed with Persian and Arabic), and lastly the Basques of the Pyrenees. That strange language, the riddle of philology, is the most isolated in the world. As far as grammar and phonetic laws are concerned, it stands nearest to the Ugrian, the class to which the Hungarian belongs; there is no doubt that it once occupied a much larger area than now; though there is no evidence to shew that Europe was once occupied by a homogeneous population of which the Finns were the northern and the Basques the south-western extremes (see Latham, *Elements of Comparative Philology*, p. 677). Professor Huxley (in a lecture reported in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 10, 1870) started a novel theory. Relying on the facts that the Kelts are universally described by Roman and Greek as a tall, blue-eyed, fair-skinned people, whilst a dark-skinned black-eyed race now exists in England, Ireland, and France, side by side with the lighter race, the dark predominating in each country in the S. and W., the light in the N. and E.; and that Caesar states the language spoken by the Aquitani (S. of the Garonne) was not Keltic; he concludes that this language was the Basque, that the people speaking this language were the primitive inhabitants of the S. of France, Spain (Iberi), and Sicily: that this people has been everywhere broken up by the Kelts; that the Keltic language has everywhere prevailed, but that the Iberian blood has remained unchanged in proportion; (he relies here on the analogy of Cornwall and the universal spread of the English language there;) and that this Iberian blood is the origin of the so-called black Kelts both in Ireland and England.

This hypothesis is bold and ingenious. I do not agree with it, because I do not believe, as Professor Huxley does, that a language ever yet died out without leaving some trace of itself at least in local names. In Cornwall, the Keltic language has

CH. II.

completely died out in ordinary use, but that Cornwall was originally occupied by a Keltic population is shewn as clearly by the names of places, as it would be if not a word of English had ever been spoken there. And this is true of parts of England where the Keltic language has been extinct for centuries, e.g. in East Anglia, where the Keltic river-names, Ouse, Rhee, perhaps Cam, &c. remain. But what trace is there of an element akin to the Basque in the names of places in England and Ireland? Nay, if the admixture of races was not before all historic time, there ought to be left some trace of the Basque element even in the words of our ordinary speech: for there are fairly numerous traces of the Keltic there.

Lastly what linguistic proof is there of the connection between the Basques and the Iberi?

CHAPTER III.

ROOTS AND SUFFIXES.

IT is important to know clearly what we mean by this term, a "root." I think that it is often supposed when we say, for example, that DA is a root meaning to give, or I a root meaning to go; that in arriving at these roots we have arrived at some ultimate facts from which to start back and explain the whole constitution of language; that in fact it is a law of nature that DA must mean to give, I must mean to go. Now in the first place we must carefully remember that it is only for the Indo-European family that DA means to give. It is not so for the whole human race. So if there were some inherent necessity that DA should mean "to give," that necessity would exist only for one family of mankind—confessedly the most important family—but still only one out of the human race. If indeed this fact were universally true, all our philological inquiries would have been but steps in the inquiry into the origin of language as a whole. But it is quite possible to examine the relation of a Greek word to other Greek words, or to cognate words in Sanskrit and Gothic and Latin, without being involved in the question whether the so-called Bow-wow and Pooh-pooh theories are true or not. That all language did originally spring from imitational and interjectional sounds *combined*—not from one or the other separately as has been implied sometimes—I for one firmly believe, not seeing any other possible origin for language. But the furthest and earliest time to which the history of the Indo-European language can be traced does not come any way near to that really

CH. III.

*What is a
"root"?*

CH. III.

Connection
between
roots and
ideas.

primeval time. The tolerably developed vowel system of the Indo-European language, its power of expressing modifications of idea by change of vowels, and the extent to which this method has superseded the older and simpler method of reduplication; the general lightness and flexibility of its roots; its inflexional system already suffering from decay; these and many other facts may give some idea of the lapse of time which must have separated the earliest historically traceable stage of the language of Europe from those first beginnings of all speech. And the more clearly we understand this, the less shall we be inclined to admit any necessary connection of sound and sense even in the Indo-European roots. What probability is there that any analysis can give us the ultimate form of those roots? Is it not, on the other hand, certain that in all that vast prehistoric time they must have been undergoing changes analogous to those we find during those ages in which we can trace their development? If, then, we cannot know with certainty their ultimate form, of what scientific use can speculations be upon the connection between them and the ideas they express? That there was some connection originally I believe; but I do not believe that it is ever discoverable with certainty: and that it was ever necessary, I deny. Dr Farrar¹ mentions the frequent occurrence of the combination *st* to express stability. Undoubtedly the root *sta* and extensions of it—*stav*, *star*, *stambh*, &c.—are found in all the Indo-European languages. He proceeds: "There must have been some reason for this; and we believe it to be furnished by the simple instinctive "Lautgeberde"—*st*! a sound peculiarly well adapted to demand attention (compare *whist!* *usht*, &c.), and therefore well adapted to express stopping and standing as the immediate results of an awakened attention." Very possible: but how is it to be proved? How do we know that *sta* is the ultimate form of the root? It would be quite in analogy with the deve-

¹ *Chapters on Language*, c. 18, p. 202.

lopment of other roots (e.g. *gan*, *gnâ*) that a more original form was *sat*: in which case the explanation does not seem so probable. It is essentially a guess and incapable of verification. On this question of the connection between idea and form, I adopt unhesitatingly Renan's view¹, "*La liaison du sens et du mot n'est jamais nécessaire, jamais arbitraire, toujours elle est motivée.*" The force of the latter part of this maxim will, I hope, appear more fully in the course of this work.

A root has been defined by Curtius² as "that combination of sounds which remains when a word is stripped of everything formative." The result however will not always be the root in its simplest form: but this will always be recoverable from some cognate word. Thus, *λόγος*, when analysed, shews the case-suffix *ς* and the formative suffix *ο*; but the remainder *λογ-* is not the root, but the root with the vowel modified: the true form *λεγ* is given by *λέγω*. Or, again, take the word *γίγνομαι*. Here strip off the reduplication *γι*, the termination *μαι*, and the connecting vowel *ο*, we have left *γν*, an unpronounceable result. But the true Greek root *γεν* is preserved for us in *γένος*, &c., the *ε* having been lost in the verb in the striving for lightness of sound, a tendency which we shall see has had so wide effect on language as to be entitled to the name of a law. A root then to me is simply an abstraction³, a convenient heading under which to class different words belonging to the same family, a help when we wish to investigate their affinities to each other, or their relation to words of another family, or again of another language. For these are the only proper objects of Comparative Philology, at least in its present stage: and they are quite enough to occupy philologists for many years to come, instead of investigating problems for the solution of which there are not yet—perhaps never will be—sufficient data.

*Definition
of a root.*

¹ *De l'Origine du langage*, p. 148.

² *Gr. Et.* p. 45.

³ See however M. Müller, II. 84, &c.

CH. III.

Each language has its own roots.

From this point of view we can speak of a Greek, or a Sanskrit, root as well as of an Indo-European root—not implying that it is the simplest form traceable, but the simplest in that language. Thus I spoke above of the “Greek root $\gamma\epsilon\nu$,” and this is the oldest distinctive Greek form. But ϵ is never an original vowel of any root in any Indo-European language, and comparison with the Sanskrit *jan*, with a knowledge of the phonetic changes found in each language, leads us to the original Indo-European *gan*, the oldest traceable form. Still for Greek philology it is convenient and permissible to speak of the root $\gamma\epsilon\nu$. I confess that I do not like the metaphor; it seems to me to imply too much, almost some power of growth inherent in the “root.” But the term has become so established that it is hopeless to think of changing it; and no harm can be done so long as we know clearly what we mean when we use it—that we are only employing a label (as it were) to distinguish a number of phenomena; not thereby giving any explanation of them¹.

This application of the term root to the ultimate forms of particular languages may also be justified for the sake of clearness; since, if we refer all Greek roots back to their presumably original Indo-European form, we shall confuse, as Professor Curtius has pointed out, roots the most dissimilar. Thus there is a Greek $\sqrt{\gamma\alpha\rho}$ = to call, found in $\gamma\eta\rho\upsilon\varsigma$; another $\sqrt{\gamma\rho\epsilon}$ = to awaken; and another $\sqrt{\gamma\epsilon\rho}$ = to be old, in $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$. All these Greek roots may be traced back to the simpler form GAR, which is attested both by the laws of phonetic change, to be hereafter stated, and by the occurrence of derivatives in all these senses in the sister languages: thus GAR appears in the sense of “chattering” in *garrire*, where custom and use have given the word a slightly different sense from that of $\gamma\eta\rho\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$; the same form must underlie the anomalous Sanskrit $\sqrt{j\acute{a}dgr\bar{i}}$ = to wake, which is only \sqrt{gar} irregularly reduplicated and then weakened; thirdly, it appears in

¹ Cf. Farrar, *Chapters on Language*, p. 97.

the Sanskrit *jaras*, "old age," with only the weakening of *g* to *j* common in Sanskrit. If therefore we wish to trace the words belonging to these three classes back in every case to the presumably earliest form, we should be justified in saying that the simplest traceable form in each case is GAR. But what do we gain by this? It is much better for Greek philology to retain the three distinct forms, than to speak of three distinct roots by one form. Indeed it is to my mind most probable that at a still earlier but pre-historic period, all three roots were distinct in form; and that each afterwards passed into the form GAR by regular processes of mechanical change.

We sometimes find two roots slightly differing in form but of the same meaning, or such that the meaning of one is obviously deducible from the meaning of the other. Thus we have (occurring in Sanskrit) a \sqrt{yu} to join, and another \sqrt{yuj} with the same meaning: this second root must be corrupted from YUG, whence *iugum* and *ζυγόν*. Between these two roots there is not the slightest difference of meaning, only of sound. Again, there is another root YUDH meaning in Sanskrit "to fight," found in the Homeric *ὑσμίνη* for *γυδ-μινη*, which seems originally to have meant to "join battle," just as in the phrases "miscere pugnam," "conserere manus," &c. If so, YUDH is YU limited in its use, to join, but only to join in a particular way,

Secondary roots;

Now it is only reasonable to assume some connection here; to suppose that one of these forms is original, and the other derived from it: and the most probable supposition is that the simplest form is commonly the earliest. It is convenient to mark this distinction and therefore YU is called a *primary* root: while YUG and YUDH are *secondary* roots. We may define a secondary root as a modification of a primary one—commonly to express some extension or limitation of the idea—by the addition of a letter or letters, generally at the end of the original root.

CH. III.

formed by
adding
initial
letters (?),

by vowel-
change,

and espe-
cially by
adding
consonants
at the end
of the root.

Cases where the letter is added at the beginning of a root are rare and indeed not very certain: that is, we cannot be sure whether the apparently primary is not a weakened form of the secondary¹: e.g. we do not know which is older, $\sqrt{\text{scalp}}$ in *scalpo*, *σκόλοψ*, or $\sqrt{\text{glab}}$ in *glaber*, *γλαφυρός*: the two roots differ slightly both in form and meaning, and yet can apparently be referred to a common source; but which is the older cannot be told with certainty.

Sometimes although no addition be made, the form of a root can be modified by internal vowel-change. In this case we get another class of secondary roots. Thus, for example, there is a root TAR, expressing motion with friction: from this in its simplest form we get *τέρω* and *τέρην*, *tero*, &c. From the vocalic nature of *r*, any root in which it occurs can take it either before or after the vowel: hence we get TRA, which is rather a modified form of TAR than a secondary not properly so called: but this *a* can be modified into *i* and *u*, and then we get distinct secondary roots TRI and TRU: the first is found in *triticum*; the second in *τρώ*, &c. In neither of these is there any variation of sense: but from them, with the simple root, a large number of secondaries of the more common kind can be produced. Thus from TAR we get TARK apparently with the sense of whirling round in *torqueo*, *torques*, &c.; and in Greek *ἀτρεκής*, "that which is not turned or twisted," and so "true;" also *ἄτρακτος* "the straight," whether arrow or spindle: and—so closely akin in meaning that one must suppose the *p* to have arisen by labialism from *k*—*τρέπω* and *trepidus*, "turning round," whether in eagerness or fear. We have next TRAM, whence *τρέμω* and *tremo*, shewing the same sense as the last: and TRAS whence *τρέω* (i.e. *τρεσ-ω*) and *τρηρός* (i.e. *τρεσ-ερος*) whence *τρήρων*, the timid bird, always used of the pigeon, and *terreo* (for *ters-eo*): and TRAN, whence *τιτραίνω* and *τόρνος*, where more of the original

¹ See *Gr. Et.* p. 58.

meaning is seen, and *τρανής*, apparently "bored, right through," "clear," "distinct." Then from TRI we get TRIB in *τρίβω* and *tribula* a threshing-machine, whence the ecclesiastical metaphor of *tribulatio*: whilst from TRU we have TRUP in *τρύπανον* a borer, and *τρύπαω*, and TRUGH in *τρύχω* to wear out. It is observable that the secondaries of these modified forms keep throughout closer to the meaning of the primary root than its own secondaries do.

There has been much speculation upon the origin of these secondary roots. It is not necessary that the new element should always have been dynamic. It may have been sometimes originally phonetic: this agrees with the fact that a change of meaning is not always conveyed by it. But even if phonetic in its origin, it could be used dynamically: just as the phonetic variations of *a—α, e, o—* were employed, as has been already pointed out. The probability of a phonetic origin is greatest where the new element was nasal. Beside the root GA (=to produce), there existed in Indo-European days a root GAN, with the same sense: MA was expanded into MAN; perhaps the simpler form retained generally more of the simple signification of "measuring," while the latter expressed the abstract idea, needed even in those days, of "thinking." Similarly HA (=to kill) was expanded in Sanskrit to *√han* with the same sense: and if the Greek *√φεν* in *πέφ(ε)ν-ω* be the same root, the secondary form must also be ascribed to ancient times. The development of BHA (=to shine) into BHAN is found also in Sanskrit and Greek; the new root is well employed but with a curious difference by the two peoples. While the Greeks used the simple root chiefly in the sense of making clear by language (i.e. of speaking, in *φαμί, φήμη*¹, they employed the secondary root to give the original sense, as *φαίνω*,

Origin
of these
secondary
roots.

¹ The apparent exception *φάος* is probably to be referred to another secondary root *φαF*, which is found in the Pindaric *ὑπόφαντις* (*Pyth.* 2. 76), and *ὑπόφανσις* (Herod. vii. 36); the former word having the derived, the latter the primary meaning.

CH. III.

φανή = a torch: the Hindus on the contrary kept the primary sense to the primary root; while \sqrt{bhan} appears in the Vedas = to praise. Now this *n*, since it did not in the majority of cases modify the original idea, may very well have been phonetic in its origin, something like the ν ἐφέλκυστικόν; or perhaps it nasalises the previous vowel, like the nasal vowels commonly heard in France¹. But this explanation will not suit all these “determinatives” as Curtius calls them²: final *k*, or *t* or *d* must be accounted for otherwise. A very ingenious hypothesis of Prof. Pott’s is that these secondary roots are combinations of two simple roots: thus ἐσ-θ-ίω is from two distinct roots: \sqrt{ed} and $\sqrt{\theta\epsilon}$ = eat-put; the Sanskrit \sqrt{yudh} being similarly from \sqrt{yu} and \sqrt{dha} ³. From this same DHA to place, Pott would compound the Latin *ten-do* (from \sqrt{ten}) —not improbably. No one doubts that *ab-do*, *condo*, &c., are from this root, whose primary meaning was obscured in Latin: it may therefore have come to be regarded as merely a formative element, and employed even in cases like *tendo*, where the combination is no longer etymologically appropriate. This hypothesis however as well as the first seems hardly adequate for the whole set of determinatives; it is not easy to see what the roots could have been with sense sufficiently vague to supply them all. But it will undoubtedly account for some. Lastly it has been supposed that these letters are “pronominal roots,” the nature of which will be explained immediately. Here again we seem to have a satisfactory explanation for those letters which are identical with known pronominal roots, but not for the others. It is by far the most likely that all these methods were in use, and probably others which have not yet been detected. Prof. Key⁴ considers the second consonant to belong to the class which he calls “excrecent,” i.e. developed phonetically by the preceding

¹ See next Chapter.

² See numerous examples in Ferrar’s *Comp. Gram.* Vol. I. p. 189.

³ See *G. E.* p. 67.

⁴ *Language: its origin and development*, p. 111.

consonant, from deficiency in clearness of articulation. Such consonants unquestionably exist, and some certain examples will be given afterwards¹. Prof. Key points out truly that they are mostly dentals: and he thinks that as they thus lie half-way between gutturals and labials they were naturally produced after either, or after other dentals. In this way he accounts for $\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\theta\text{-}\iota\omega$ and others. It cannot be denied that in some cases the sound in question may be, in this way, of phonetic origin. But I am sure that it is not so in many of the cases which Prof. Key gives.

There are a few secondary roots in which the new final element is a vowel. Such are GNĀ (*gno-sco*) by the side of GAN (*gen-us*) and MNĀ by MAN; and we have many such double roots in Greek, e.g. $\sqrt{\tau\alpha\lambda}$ and $\tau\lambda\bar{\alpha}$, $\sqrt{\delta\alpha\mu}$ and $\sqrt{\delta\mu\bar{\alpha}}$, with no difference in meaning; but there is a very decidedly derived sense perceptible in the first two mentioned. Prof. Benfey believes that the final $\bar{\alpha}$ was produced by the accent falling upon the connecting vowel between the root and the verbal suffix, e.g. *gan-ā-mi*, which forced out the radical vowel, and formed thereby a practically new verb ready to bear a different sense. I think this very probable. Still the fact that the radical vowel is lost in each case undoubtedly supports Schleicher's law of the convertibility of position of the radical vowel, e.g. that a root AK implies also a by-form KA, the vowel being able to be sounded before or after the last consonant at pleasure. The new root form could then be taken if wanted, to express a new idea (as GNĀ): where no such want was felt, the two roots were used indifferently. I think that this law should be at least restricted to cases where the consonant moved is a liquid or nasal: there is then a reason for it, the exceedingly vocal nature of the sound: whilst I can see nothing to account for such a change as AK to KA². But even if it were so restricted

Secondary roots formed with a final vowel.

¹ See ch. xi. § 7.

² See on this point Prof. Benfey in *Gött. Gel. Anzeige* for 1865, p. 1376.

CH. III.

Pronominal roots.

the law would cover all the distinctly secondary roots so formed. On this hypothesis then GNĀ does not differ in its origin from TRA, TRI, TRU mentioned above; they may have suffered the vowel to be weakened afterwards: it would therefore not need to be classed separately. It is to be observed that, in any case, the vowel is produced by phonetic, not by dynamic, causes.

I have spoken above of a "pronominal root," as of something distinct from the roots hitherto considered. Those roots are sufficient to explain all verbs and all nouns: not that we can always for every verb and noun lay our hands on the actual root: but we do know the roots of so much the larger number of them, that we infer by analogy that the others really have similar roots, though we may not be able to find them. Now by these roots is expressed a possibility of action: the verbs formed from them denote the action itself, the nouns denote a person, thing, or state, existent or conceivable, concerned in or resulting from that action. In all these the connection of each derivative with the root is more or less distinct. DA expresses potential giving: *δίδωμι* and *do*, I actually give; *δοτήρ* and *dator* are the giver; *donum* is the thing given; *δότης* is the state of giving. There is no doubt that all these are to be referred to one idea, expressed by a particular root: and though some nouns cannot be accounted for so clearly, we do not doubt that there is some root under which they also could be classified. But what are we to say to the pronouns (as they are called)? or to particles in general? We can take *is*, *ea*, *id*, &c. or *mei*, *mihi* and the other cases of the first pronoun, except the nominative, and get to an ultimate form, *i* in one case and *ma* in the other. But these are not at all like *da* above: they denote no action, to which their derivatives can be reasonably and intelligibly referred. No doubt there is a root *i*, which denotes "going," and another, *ma*, which expresses "measuring:" and the pronouns have actually been re-

They denote relation in space.

ferred to these: but there is no satisfactory connection of meaning¹.

Pronouns are *general*, for they are terms convertible not with a particular person or thing, but with many persons and things; and in most cases they denote some relation, either of the speaker to the person or thing spoken of, or between the two. It is obvious that no root denoting action, however unrestricted, is sufficient here. Now the simplest way in which I can conceive of relation between myself and some object is that I am here and it is there; that there is a certain space between us; and this or some such conception is absolutely necessary to connect together the objects for which ordinary roots have given us names. Accordingly it is suggested, with great probability, that pronouns and pronominal particles (i.e. conjunctions and some adverbs and prepositions) are formed immediately from sound (primarily interjectional) by which the speaker first expressed that this thing was near to him, and that thing farther away: and afterwards by adding them together expressed motion from the one to the other. These may be called roots as well as those of which we have already spoken; and if we believe that all roots whatever were originally interjectional, we must hold that their origin is the same: but their use is so different that it is well to have different terms for them².

¹ The objection to this theory that roots are *special*, and pronouns *general*, is not conclusive, for though it is undoubtedly true that most roots were originally special, i.e. denoting not merely "going," for example, but going in some special way, yet it cannot be shewn that *all* roots were so restricted: this one, *i*, seems to have been always used of going, generally.

² The principal roots of this class in the Indo-European were *a* whence probably the augment, which is *a* in Sanskrit, and perhaps

e-go, *ā-sme-s* (*hμéis*), &c.

i in *i-d*, *i-ta*, *i-pse*, *ov-roo-l* (perhaps), &c.

ka in *quod*, Ionic *kws*, *koré*, &c., *hi-c(e)*, *ho(d)-c(e)*, (*c*)*ubi*, *ali-cu-bi*, &c.

ta in *ró*, *ov-ro-s*, *is-te*, &c.

sa in *ó*, old Latin *so-s* (*he*), *sa* (*she*), *i-s(e)-te*, *si-c(e)*:

na in *vó*, *nos*, *ne*, *num*, &c.

ma in *mo-v*, *me-i*, *μή*, &c.

ya in *ós*, *ws*, *ta-m*, &c.

va in *uos*, *av* (?)

See Leo Meyer i. 323, Ferrar, i. 186.

CH. III.

It is not pretended that we can say with any certainty which of these originally denoted "here" and which "there." Different people differ immensely as to the impressions a particular sound is calculated to convey: and here the senses assigned are so very general that it is quite conceivable that the same sound might be taken for either. Therefore, as before I refrained from speculation about the original sense of the common roots, so here also I refrain; and only assert that there is a class of roots, probably distinct in character from the others, and which in practice at least should certainly be kept distinct.

Bases—
intermediate
between
roots and
words.

Formative
suffixes;

verbal
suffixes,

nominal
suffixes.

We have now seen the different kinds of roots. But there is an intermediate stage—sometimes more than one—between roots and words. I have said before that a root gave expression for potentiality; we want now something to denote action, the simple idea not yet modified by the consideration of the actor or the person acted upon; and something to denote a thing or state, not yet in relation to any other thing or person, but the bare idea of the thing. This is the "base" or "stem," which is the root with the addition of a "formative suffix." The two terms are commonly used indifferently, but it would be well to distinguish them, and to speak here of a base only. A base may be either "verbal" or "nominal," according as a verb or a noun is to be formed from it: and the same distinction may be applied to the suffixes. The verbal suffixes are principally *-ya* or *-aya*: whence we get the bases of all the contracted verbs in Greek; thus *τιμάω* = *τιμ-aya-o(μ)*, &c., and of the Latin first, second, and fourth conjugations, as *amo* = *amāo* = *am-aya-o*, *moneo* = *mon-eya-o*, *audio* = *aud-iya-o*. The nominal suffixes are much more numerous; the following list for the Indo-European is given by Schleicher—*a*, *i*, *u*, *ya*, *va*, *vant*, *ma*, *mant*, *ra*, *ana*, *an*, *na*, *nī*, *ta*, *tar*, *tra*, *ti*, *tu*, *dhi*, *as*, *ka*, *yans*. Sometimes two suffixes are found together; they may then be distinguished as primary and secondary suffixes, e.g. *ta* + *ya* (in Greek *πρᾶκ-τεο*), *ma* + *na* (Greek *ἰε-μενο*-, Lat.

ter-mino-), *ta + na* (Gr. ἐπηρε-*ravo*, Lat. *cras-tino*), *ta + ra* (Gr. προ-*τερο-*), *ta + ma* (Lat. *op-tumo*), *ma + ta* (Gr. πν-*ματο-*), *ta + ta* (Gr. ὑσ-*τατο-*); and the bases so formed as secondary bases. Not unfrequently however the simple root is employed without undergoing the change into a base: thus *dux* is only the root *duc*, with the *s* of the nominative, *φα-μι* (Att. *φημι*) is nothing but the root with the suffix of the first person. But much more commonly a formative suffix intervenes. Very frequently a nominal base is used to form a verb as well as a noun; e.g. *κορύσσω* is formed from *κορυθ* the nominal base of *κόρυς*; the Latin *acu-o* is from *acu(s)*, a needle. Such verbs are called denominative or (better) nominal verbs.

Denomina-
tive or
nominal
verbs.

There is a considerable number of verbal suffixes which are certainly formative, and generally classified with those above mentioned: yet they differ from them in use so far as to make a separate name desirable, even though their origin is probably the same. The formative suffixes which we have mentioned are practically equivalent to determinatives: they are found in all the tenses of a verb: but these of which I am now speaking are found only in the present and kindred tenses, and so are always felt to be separable. They are commonly called "conjugational" or "stem-suffixes:" the latter name is preferable¹. I doubt whether Schleicher be right in including among these suffixes *a*, which is found as *ε* and *ο* in *φέρ-ε-τε* and *φέρ-ο-μεν*, as *i* and *u* in *ueh-i-tis*, and *ueh-u-nt*: this seems to me to be more probably a mere connecting vowel which binds together the root and the personal suffixes, so as to avoid the combination of too many consonants. But to this class belong *να*, in *σκιδ-να-μαι*, *li-no*, *sper-no*, &c.; and *νυ* found in *στορ-έν-νυ-μι*, &c., but not in Latin. Then comes the suffix *γα*, a very Proteus in

Stem-
suffixes.

¹ The nature and object of the "present stem" will be considered in chapter vi. The verbal-suffixes already mentioned might then be distinguished from these as "base-suffixes;" these two kinds making up the list of formative verbal-suffixes.

CH. III.

Greek; appearing as *ι*, in *ιδ-ι-ω*, in *κα-ι-ω* and *δα-ι-ω*, sometimes out of place as *φα-ι-ν-ω*, *τε-ι-ν-ω*, *ἀ-ι-ρ-ω*, *πε-ι-ρ-ω* where the *γ* originally followed the *ν* and *ρ*; as *ε* in *δοκ-έ-ω*, *γαμ-έ-ω*, *ᾠθ-έ-ω*, *κυρ-έ-ω*, &c., verbs which in the present stem are undistinguishable from those formed with *αγα*, but distinguished by the restriction of the suffix to that stem: sometimes it passes by assimilation into a consonantal group—into *λλ* in *βάλλω* (for *βαλ-γω*); *στέλλω*, &c., or *σσ* (*ττ*) *φρίσσω*, *πτήσσω*, *λίσσομαι*, *ἐρέσσω*, &c., whose history will become more intelligible when described under consonantal change in Greek; or lastly into *ζ* in *κράζω*, *ῥέζω*, *ᾠζω*, &c. In Latin the same suffix is more recognisable in the *i-* verbs of the 3rd (primitive) class: as *cap-i-o*, *iac-i-o*, *fod-i-o*, &c.: some have passed by analogy into the 4th class, e.g. *mug-i-o*, *rug-i-o*, &c. Probably we find assimilation in *pel-l-o*, *cur-r-o*, *mit-t-o*, &c.: though Curtius thinks not. Next comes *ska*, in *βό-σκ-ω*, *gno-sc-o*, a well-known suffix: and lastly one, not Indo-European, but found in both Greek and Latin, *ta*, in *τύπ-τ-ω*, *ἀν-ύ-τ-ω*, and *pec-t-o*, *flec-t-o*, &c.

What
were these
suffixes
originally?

I have said that these stem-suffixes probably did not differ in origin from the formatives, *γα* and *αγα*: and the question naturally arises, what were all these suffixes—verbal and nominal—in the beginning?

Clearly no certain answer can be given: but the number of suffixes is sufficiently great, and their use sufficiently different, to enable us to compare them together in different ways, and so speculate with some degree of probability. It would seem that they must have been either verbal or pronominal roots, since all the rough material of speech divides itself into one of these two classes. If pronominal, they must have been quite general, modifying the root at first in the slightest possible way, and only restricted afterwards to special significations: if verbal, they were at least more 'special, and directly limited the application of the root from the very beginning. To begin with verbal suffixes—*sk* has more the look of a

Probably
the verbal
were in
the main

common than a pronominal root. Corssen thinks it may have been a corruption of SAK—the Latin *sequ-or*, *sec-un-dus*—so that $\beta\acute{o}\sigma\kappa\omega$ should mean “I go after feeding.” That “to go” can be used with another root as a mere auxiliary is clear from our own periphrastic English future “I am going to tell:” we may compare¹ “je vais dire” with the same meaning: and then for the amalgamation we have the analogy of *j’aime-ai* and *ama-bo*. Similarly *ya* and the base suffix *a-ya* may be connected with YA, a secondary root formed from I “to go:” this would support and be supported by the hypothesis that the modal-suffix² *ya* (*sim*, old form *siem* = (e)s-*yā-m*(i), $\epsilon\lambda\eta\nu = \acute{\epsilon}(\sigma)\iota\eta-\nu = \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\text{-}y\acute{\alpha}-\mu\iota$) had originally the same meaning. I do not know any common root to which *na* and *nu* can be referred on any probable analogy: they have rather a pronominal look. The pronominal character is still more apparent if we pass from verbal to nominal suffixes. In form these generally coincide with known pronominal roots. And their use points in the same direction. I have said that, if pronominal, they must have been suffixed at first to modify the root in a general way. Consequently a great many different suffixes would at first be applied vaguely to denote the same indefinite idea; as a rule only one, the best fitted, would survive with a tolerably definite sense; sometimes however more than one would remain. On the other hand, the original vagueness would make it easy for the same suffix to be applied to more than one idea. In a word, we should expect to find two results existing side by side; more than one suffix to denote one idea, one suffix to denote more than one idea. And this, I think, we do find, down to a comparatively very late period. An instance will be found in the use of the suffixes *ta* and *ma* and their combinations by the Greeks and Latins, we find *ta*, in $\pi\rho\omega\text{-}\tau\omicron$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\text{-}\tau\omicron$, *quarto*; *ma* in $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\delta\omicron\text{-}\mu\omicron$, *pri-mo*, *infi-mo*; *ta+ta* in $\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\text{-}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron$; *ta+ma* in *op-tumo*; *ma-ta* in

CH. III.
common
roots.

The nomi-
nal were
in the
main pro-
nominal
roots.

¹ With Max Müller, I. 218.

² See page 57.

πυματο, αὐτο-ματο, &c. That is to say, in the two languages the same suffix is used to denote both a superlative and an ordinal; each of the two suffixes denotes either, and the two are combined indifferently to denote a superlative. The vagueness of meaning therefore survived till Graeco-Italian times at least: we should be justified in saying even after the separation by the two separate forms *-tumo* and *ματο*, each occurring, I think, only in one language. This loose applicability of the suffixes, felt down to late times, and the fact that the forms agree, are two arguments which seem to me fairly strong for the pronominal origin of most nominal suffixes. I say "most," because for some a verbal origin is clearly possible: such are *tar* (δο-τερ, *dator*) which commonly denotes action, though here it may be said on the other side that this sense is not always obvious (as in *pater*, &c.); and *dhi*, which is found in the Greek infinitive -θαι, the locative of a nominal base, and may be from DHA "to place." So in conclusion I think that of verbal suffixes the majority are probably formed from common roots, though a few may be pronominal; and of nominal suffixes the majority are pronominal, but a few may be from common roots. But it should again be pointed out that all such conclusions rest on very scanty evidence.

We have seen that sometimes more than one nominal suffix is used. Thus ἀληθες is formed from λαθ by the suffix ες (*ās*): and from this again by the suffix ya is formed ἀληθες-ya or ἀληθε-ia. So in Latin *contio* is *con-ven-ti-on* where we have two suffixes: and the number is increased to five in *contionabundo*-. It is a disputed point whether some apparent combinations of suffixes are not themselves the older forms, from which the simpler and shorter forms have been degraded. Thus, for example, it is commonly held (by Curtius and Schleicher amongst others) that *ma*, *ta*, *na*, are the older forms from which longer ones, *man*, *mat*, have been compounded. Professor Benfey on the contrary would postulate a prior form *mant*,

Are the
fuller or
the shorter
forms of
the suffixes
the older?

from which came, by different weakenings, *man* and *mat*, and lastly *ma*; we may compare for *mant* the closely analogous *vant*, found e.g. in $\chi\alpha\rho\iota$ - Fevr . From these participial terminations *mant*, *vant*, *ant*, by far the greater body of nouns could be derived by phonetic changes for which there is sufficient analogy: from *vant* would come *van*, *vat*, *vin*: from *ant* come *an*, *in*, *a*, *i*, *u*, or this last series might come directly from *vant*. Thus nearly all nouns would be participles of verbs. The difficulty of this theory is to conceive how these *mant* and *vant* first arose. I can imagine no way except by combination on the ordinary theory. Still I believe that in many cases Prof. Benfey is right—that the shorter forms, as we now have them, rose from corruption of fuller ones. Thus we find in Sanskrit *nāman* for *gnā-man* a “name,” Latin *nomen*, Gothic *namin*: from these we infer the suffix *man*. But in Greek we find \acute{o} - $\nu\omicron$ - $\mu\alpha\tau$ —the τ of course disappearing in the nominative, so that $\mu\alpha$ only is left. Now either *n* passed into *t* in Greek, which is in the highest degree improbable: or the Greeks used a different suffix, which is possible, but from the antiquity of the form in *-man* (shewn by its wide spread) and the preference of the Greeks for final *n*, is unlikely; or the two forms must be referred to a fuller form *gnā-mant*: which I think most likely.

I think I have now touched upon all points connected with formative suffixes. We have seen the formation of nominal bases, which are ready to be turned into actual nouns by “case suffixes.” We have got verbal bases or verb-stems, or sometimes the simple root, which in this connection may be called a base, ready to become actual verbs by the addition of “modal suffixes” (*a* or *ya* for the subjunctive and optative respectively); of “tense suffixes” (as *sya* for the future, *sa* for the compound aorist, *a* for the perfect, &c.); and lastly of “personal suffixes” (*mi*, *si*, *ti*, or the further corruptions of these). All these four kinds are “inflectional suffixes,” and their history does not properly come into the province of special etymology. Their

*Inflectional
suffixes
not to be
described
here.*

CH. III.

use belongs to grammar: their origin can indeed be guessed at by the comparative etymologist, as indeed it has been by the founder of the science, Franz Bopp. But these original forms can only be recovered by comparison of many more languages than I propose to deal with. Also they afford less real material for speculation than even the formative suffixes. They are practically much fewer: each one in each language, however often it may occur, is really only a single specimen, not a member of a class which can be compared with other members. Their original meaning is still more difficult to determine with any certainty; because there is really no limit to the number of formations, any one of which would be sufficient to express these extremely general conceptions¹.

¹ For convenience of the student I will give a table at the end of the volume containing the Greek and Latin variations of the forms of the case suffixes. Full information containing all the theories on this subject may be found in Schleicher's excellent *Compendium*, II. 13, "Wortbildung," §§ 244—308; and (so far as the nouns and pronouns are concerned) in Ferrar's *Comp. Grammar*, I. 199—end. Curtius' *Tempora und modi* is a most suggestive book for the verbs.

CHAPTER IV.

SOUNDS.

It may be regarded as established that at a time not long before the first great separation of the Indo-European family, their alphabet contained fifteen consonants, and three vowels. The consonants are best arranged thus: nine momentary, and six or seven continuous sounds—the terms will be explained shortly. The nine momentary sounds are subdivided into (1) K, T, P, called variously hard, surd, voiceless, *tenuēs*; (2) G, D, B, called soft, sonant, voiced, *medial*; (3) GH, DH, BH, soft aspirates¹. The continuous sounds comprise the nasals, N and M; the three spirants Y, S, V; and R; if, as is possible, L should be added, this is a sixteenth letter.

In vowels, we find three simple sounds, A, I, U. Each of these vowels was further varied by an addition of vowel sound. By uttering a new *a* before the radical vowel of a word our forefathers had gained three combinations of sound—*a+a=ā*, *a+i=ai*, *a+u=au*. The origin of this *a* will be discussed in Ch. VI. The diphthongs *ai* and *au* are not found in their simple form in the derived languages: but their existence is certified by the substitutes in those languages, which point to *ai* and *au* as their only possible origin².

Schleicher believes that this process had been repeated before the separation: that *a+ā* had produced *ā* again,

¹ It is quite possible that these three sounds may be later than the rest; it is probable from their greater complexity and difficulty of utterance. But at all events they are older than the separation.

² Thus *Vaika*, a house, is clearly from Sk. *veça*, Zd. *vaēça*, Gk. *oikos*, old Lat. *ueicos*, Goth. *veihsa*: *Vaida* is required by Sk. *veda*, Gk. *oīda*, Goth. *vait*.

CH. IV.

*The sounds
of the
original
language.*

*Extension
of the
vowels.*

CH. IV.

$a + ai$ had produced $\bar{a}i$, and $a + au$, $\bar{a}u$. This second step in each vowel-scale is clearly established for the Asiatic family: and there are considerable indications of the existence of the same in Europe, especially in Greek, Gothic, and Lithuanian. But there is so much discordance in the application of these assumed second steps in these languages, that the belief is gaining ground that the first steps only in each scale are Indo-European, and that the instances given of supposed common second steps are later developments, intentional or only accidental, of the different nations. This point also will be considered hereafter.

It might have been expected that just as a was raised to \bar{a} , so also i and u should have been raised to \bar{i} and \bar{u} . Indeed instances might be brought forward from the Greek of this lengthening, e.g. $\tau\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\beta\omega$ from $\sqrt{\tau\rho i\beta}$, $\lambda\bar{\omega}\omega$ from $\sqrt{\lambda\upsilon}$: some lengthenings apparently of the same kind in the Latin are not really in point, e.g. $f\bar{i}do$ from $\sqrt{f i d}$, $d\bar{u}co$ from $\sqrt{d u c}$, for these are weakenings from $feido$ and $douco$ respectively, as is proved by inscriptions; and many others are of uncertain origin. There are obvious traces of lengthening as a formative principle in all the derived languages: but there is no application of it sufficiently universal to prove that it was in use in the parent speech. Schleicher¹ indeed argues that \bar{i} and \bar{u} were unknown to the Indo-Europeans. They occur indeed constantly in Sanskrit roots: but these, as Schleicher points out, are mostly lengthened forms of simpler roots and peculiar developments of Sanskrit, the simpler form being in many cases found in the cognate language, e.g. "to be" is in Sanskrit $\sqrt{bh\bar{u}}$, but in Greek $\sqrt{\phi\bar{u}}$, Latin $\sqrt{f\bar{u}}$, so that it cannot be doubted that $BH\bar{U}$ was the primitive form. It seems highly improbable that \bar{a} should exist and not \bar{i} and \bar{u} : and it may be plausibly maintained that no man in the exercise of the ordinary powers of speech could possibly help at any time prolonging all the vowel sounds. Still the difficulty of proving the existence of \bar{i} and \bar{u}

¹ *Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sprachforschung*, I. 331.

remains. Their absence may be accounted for by two considerations; first, the comparative rarity of *ĩ* and *ũ*; secondly, the physiological fact that it is more difficult to maintain long sounds than short ones at the same quality; a common result is the production of a diphthong, i.e. two sounds of different quality, instead of one with long quantity: but the change may take different forms with different nations. The question must remain undecided; but at all events, if lengthening ever were the regular method of intensification in Indo-European speech, it was in the main superseded before the earliest sundering of the languages by the more refined method mentioned above, which may be called *qualitative*, as distinguished from mere *quantitative* increase. Such a thorough loss of a simple early linguistic process, and such a complete establishment of a later and more complex one, would be one proof amongst many of the distance at which Indo-European speech as traceable in its earliest form lies from the primitive speech of the human race, and of the consequent uncertainty of all speculations which treat roots as *absolutely* ultimate forms, and then seek to explain them on physiological grounds.

It will be seen at once that the Indo-European people did not possess nearly all the sounds which are heard upon the lips of their descendants in different parts of Europe and Asia: whilst their three aspirates have been in Europe everywhere supplanted. It is not surprising that this old alphabet should be less rich than those of more civilised nations: the development of ideas and feelings establishes in language new sounds, by finding a use for them, although it does not produce them. But it possessed all the more clearly marked vowel-positions and all the most important consonantal articulations. The greater wealth of modern times has grown from modifications of the simpler original.

I propose to examine very briefly the nature of all the more familiar sounds we now hear in England, with some

*Scantiness
of this
alphabet.*

*Fuller list
of sounds*

CH. IV.
to be now
considered.

of those heard in France, Italy and Germany. This may seem a superfluous labour; but it is not so. Some of these sounds, though not occurring in the original language, probably were heard in the Greek and Latin which we have to consider; it is better therefore to give a list of modern sounds, which is tolerably full, though it does not at all pretend to be exhaustive. We may thus get a better idea of the completeness or incompleteness of the Indo-European alphabet, and understand better its changes into Greek and Italian, and may lay a basis for any further investigation of the changes from Italian to the Romance languages¹.

Physio-
logical
difference
between
vowels
and con-
sonants.

The old division of sounds into vowels and consonants has been much objected to², and with considerable reason, if it is taken to imply the absence of affinities between vowels and consonants. But it will be retained, both for its convenience and because there is a real difference in their formation. This has been well shewn by Mr Melville Bell. When the voice in its passage through the mouth is not further modified by contact, partial or complete, of the lips or tongue, but flows through an open channel without any friction or hissing, then we have *vowel* sound. When on the other hand the sound is not complete until the action of some part of the organs of the mouth has ceased, then we have produced what we may call *consonantal* sound. Briefly, "a vowel is the result of an open

¹ The physiological side of phonetic change was only incidentally touched upon in the first edition of this work. This, it is believed, caused some indistinctness in the account there given.

² Thus Prof. Whitney (*On Lepsius' Standard Alphabet*, p. 24) argues that while some consonants (*k*, *g*, &c.) are always consonants, and some vowels (*a*, *e*, *o*) are always vowels, yet some vowels (*i*, *u*) are consonantal, while *l* and *r*, and even the nasals to some degree, are vocalic: accordingly he declines to draw a hard line between, for example, *u* and *w*; but he holds that we ought to present the entire body of known sounds in lines, ranging from the most unmixed vowel-sound to the most absolutely obstructive consonant of each class. Thus what we may call the labial line would be *a*, *au* (the English sound), *o*, *u*, *w*, *m*, *v*, *f*, *b*, *p*. No doubt such a scheme is useful in bringing clearly forward the connection of sounds: but by the definition adopted in the text it is believed that a real difference between *u* and *w* is expressed.

position of the oral organs; an articulation (this is Mr Bell's term for consonant) is the result of an opening *action* of the organ¹. Thus the so-called "semivowel" *w* seems to differ infinitesimally from *u*, and linguists have often argued to what class, consonant or vowel, it should belong. But its consonantal character is quite clear by the above definition. The organs are in precisely the same position for sounding *w* as they are for sounding *u*, the mouth being slightly open. But no prolongation of *u* will make *w*. It is not heard till there has been the slightest closure of the inner edges of the lips: and when that closure has ceased, and the lips open, then the *w* is heard. Since however this action may be exceedingly slight, the difference between *u* and *w* may be infinitely reduced.

We have thus distinguished sounds into vowels and consonants. But now comes another important distinction. The material of speech is breath, put into form by the position or action of the mouth. But this material may suffer an important change before it enters the mouth. If the glottis or aperture through which the breath passes from the windpipe be fully open², then breath pure and simple issues into the mouth, there to be moulded into sound. But the sides of this aperture are two ligaments called the chordae vocales³, and these chords are capable of tension, and of being brought together so as to close the glottis altogether. When by their approximation the glottis is narrowed, they vibrate as the breath passes through: and thus the breath is rendered sonorous, and becomes—not mere breath, but genuine voice. Now the same position of the organs of the mouth will give different results, according as breath or voice is emitted from the windpipe. Check the breath by closing the lips, and as the lips open the sound *p* is heard. But

*Difference
in the ma-
terial of
speech:*

"Hard,"
"surd," or
"breath-
sounds,"
disting-
uished
from

¹ *Principles of Speech*, p. 12.

² See however note at page 69.

³ See M. Müller's diagram, *Lectures* 2, 113.

CH. IV.

"soft,"
"sonant,"
or "voice-
sounds."

check voice in the same way, and the sound will be *b*. Physiologically there is no other difference between *p* and *b*. Many terms are in common use to express this distinction. Thus *p* and the other similarly produced sounds are called hard, or surd, or voiceless, and *b* is called soft, or sonant, or voiced. None of these terms are quite unassailable: no consonant is properly "surd:" and "voice" in ordinary speech is applied to the current of air which forms *pa*, just as much as that which forms *ba*: "voiceless" too is a mere negation; "breathed" would be better. But the name matters little if we understand the idea. In general, when I am not speaking of the method in which each sound is produced, I shall retain the names hard and soft, as being well known, conveying an intelligible idea, and not likely to mislead if properly explained. All vowels are modifications of voice, that is, soft: consonants are either breathed or voiced, hard or soft.

Double
classifica-
tion of con-
sonants:
I. accord-
ing to the
nature
of the
contact.

(i.) Mo-
mentary or
explosive
consonants.

Consonants¹ may be classified either by the nature and degree of completeness of the contact of their respective mouth-organs, or by the names of the organs concerned. Thus where the contact is complete, where the current of the breath is entirely stopped, we have *shut* or *explosive* sounds: these are the breath-sounds, *K*, *T*, *P*, with the corresponding voice-sounds, *G*, *D*, *B*. To this class must be added the aspirates *GH*, *DH*, *BH*, of the original Indo-European speech, which have been preserved unchanged by no nation except perhaps the Hindus. The distinguishing mark of these nine sounds is their incapability of prolongation: if we attempt to prolong them we only prolong the time during which the breath is pent up against the tongue or the lips, during which no sound at all is heard: the sound as before explained is merely the outbreak of the breath or voice when the obstruction is removed; and this can last but for a moment: hence these sounds are well called *Momentary*. This title marks them off from

¹ The description of the English sounds in the following sketch is taken almost entirely from Mr Bell's *Principles of Speech*.

all the others to follow, which are capable of prolongation until the air in the lungs is exhausted, these are therefore called *Continuous*, or (as distinguished from explosive) *fri-cative* sounds. In them sound is heard while the organs are still in a position more or less open according to the degree of contact: and if there were no further closing and opening of the organs, they would by definition be vowels: but, because the sound is not fully heard until the organs are relaxed from the position in which they were held, a certain action (sometimes exceedingly slight) is required, and therefore they are consonants.

I have said that the aspirates GH, DH, BH were momentary sounds: but they have some claim to an intermediate position between the two classes. They have not been retained in any European speech, and therefore their sound is strange to us, and must remain a matter of some doubt. The opinion commonly held about them is that they were not originally compound sounds (as might seem to be implied by these symbols): that is, *gh* would not be truly represented by such a compound as that in "log-house," where there are two elements of about equal importance. The sound represented by the *h* in each case was much less than this, and also was not separated from the preceding momentary sound. It was probably the slight escape of breath, which is possible at the very instant of the sundering if the contact be exceedingly slight. This appears to be the sound given to the Sanskrit aspirates in India at the present day. This slightness of contact explains the passage of unaspirated into aspirated letters which is clearly traceable in Sanskrit: this takes place almost always when the letter is combined with another consonant, generally *s*: e.g. Indo-European STA becomes Sanskrit $\sqrt{sth\bar{a}}$. Now in all compounds one part is liable to suffer: here the exertion in pronouncing the *s* diminishes the strength of contact for the *t*; and the result is a slighter *t* followed by a breath in the same action¹.

¹ Sometimes the aspirate seems to be produced by the assimilating

CH. IV.

It is because of this slighter contact, and because of the possibility of slightly prolonging the breath, that these aspirates approximate to the continuous consonants: but they are much nearer to the momentary class, and will be included in it.

(ii.) *Continuous or fricative consonants;*
(1) *nasals,*

First among the continuous letters we take the nasals, NG, N, and M, because of their close relation to the shut consonants. To explain their nature we must enter a little more into physiology. There is a cavity called the pharynx immediately behind and rather higher than the mouth: it is the termination of the throat canal, prolonged behind the soft palate, which divides it from the mouth¹; and it has a passage to the air by tubes through the nostrils. It is thus obvious that air issuing from the windpipe may finish its course in two ways: either passing above the tongue, and *below* first the soft palate, then the hard palate, and so to the mouth; or *behind* and *above* the soft palate and by the nasal tubes to the nose. Now this soft palate is moveable: it can be raised so as to cover entirely the opening of the nasal tube from the pharynx, and this is its position whilst we sound all the consonants hitherto described: during them the breath has access both to the pharynx and the mouth, but having no egress from the pharynx it is discharged from the mouth alone: the pharynx however plays an important part, for in every proper articulation the pharynx is distended with the breath, and it is the natural contraction of the pharynx alone, when the check in the mouth is removed and the air escapes, that causes the audibility of each of these letters². But if the soft palate be low enough to allow air to pass to the nostrils, as well as to the mouth-cavity,

influence of a preceding *r*, e.g. in *pra-thama* "first," where the analogy of other languages leaves no doubt that the suffix was originally *tama*.

¹ The soft palate or velum pendulum, with the tongue-like little uvula attached to it below, may be seen by any one who will stand before a glass and put his mouth into the position for sounding *Ah*.

² This is Mr Bell's account: see *Principles*, p. 44.

then the nasals are produced, whilst all the organs of the mouth are in precisely the same position as they were for the explosive consonants, and the sound is not complete till that position ceases. It is possible to produce them either with breath or voice; but it does not seem that any European nation has ever used breath-nasals. Therefore NG, N, and M, are nothing but nasal modifications of the voiced-sounds G, D, B¹. Similar modifications of vowels are clearly possible, and are actually used by the French in the words *en, on, &c.* : here the mouth is held in the required vowel-position, but some of the voice is suffered to escape through the pharynx.

While then the nasals belong to the continuous consonants, they yet have one property common with the momentary class, that they require complete contact of the mouth-organs. This is not the case with any other continuous sounds. In them the flow of the breath or voice is only slightly impeded, so that a certain amount of sound issues from the mouth before its full completion by the opening of the organs employed. Their different character, according to the difference of these organs, will be described immediately: but they may here be divided (as has been done by Mr Bell) into two classes distinguished by the nature of the contact. If the organs are in contact no longer *entirely* as for the shut consonants, but only *at the sides*, so as to leave a *central* aperture for the flow of the breath, we get the first class, to which belong the English sounds, Y, R, Sh, which is breathed, Zh, the same sound voiced and denoted in the word *seizure* by Z (in fact the French J), S, Z (as in *zest*), Wh (really Hw), and W; also many other sounds in other languages, some of which will be given shortly: these may perhaps be called central letters. But if the contact be *central*, so that the air escapes by apertures *at the side*, a second class of con-

(2) *central*
conso-
nants,

(3) *lateral*
conso-
nants.

¹ The common phrase that a person "speaks through his nose" when he has a cold, is therefore clearly erroneous. He ought to speak through his nose, but cannot; the ends of the apertures being closed: therefore instead of *m* he sounds nearly a *b*: and instead of *n* either a *d* or an *l*.

CH. IV.

tinuous sounds is produced, among which are the English L, Th (breathed as in *thin*, voiced as in *then*), F and V: let us call these lateral letters. This distinction may be seen by contrasting the English R and L. In both the fore part of the tongue is raised to the fore part of the palate: so far the method of production is the same: but in R the whole of the mouth is closed by the tongue except a very small portion of the centre of the palatal arch, by which the voice escapes¹; whilst in L that very same portion of the palate is covered by the tip of the tongue, and the voice escapes past the sides. The importance of the distinction is this: we see from it how easily letters so cognate in their formation can pass one into the other: which is notably true of R and L.

(4) *laxly
vibrated
or trilled
conso-
nants.*

A further class of sounds is distinguished by Mr Bell as being produced by a "lax vibration of the approximated organs." To this belongs the R heard in Scotland and France, and (rather modified) in parts of Germany—a roughly trilled letter, which is produced by laying the fore part of the tongue loosely against the fore part of the palate and causing it to vibrate with a strong breath. This differs essentially from the English R, in which a trill is either not at all or scarcely heard. A similar lax approximation of the uvula to the back of the tongue, and vibration from a smart breath, is said to produce the Northumberland burr.

We have thus seen that consonants are momentary, or continuous, whether central, or lateral, or vibrated. Let us now make a cross division of the same according to the organs employed in their production².

If we commence with the first portion of the air-tube which begins with the glottis and ends with the lip, the

II. Con-
sonants
arranged

¹ This is not meant as a full description of R.

² Much light will be thrown on this part of the subject by consulting the diagrams in Max Müller's second series (3rd Lecture), or Mr Bell's in *English Visible Speech for the Million*,—price one shilling. The description of the organs of speech by Prof. Huxley, in his *Elementary Lessons on Physiology*, is exceedingly clear.

first sound which seems to be consonantal, is H. Prof. Lepsius¹ holds that we pronounce this sound below the guttural point immediately at the larynx; and proposes to make it a member of a "faucal" or "laryngeal" class, the importance of which lies chiefly in Semitic speech. This is of course the spiritus asper of the Greeks. The spiritus lenis, according to the same authority, is "the sound produced by closing the throat and then opening it, to produce a vowel:" for example, in sounding the words "go 'over," care being taken that the glottis is closed between the two words: in this case a slight gurgling sound is distinctly heard before the second *o*: but if the current of breath is maintained, the vowel will be pronounced perfectly pure, and the "soft breath" will not be heard. The spiritus lenis however does not stand to the asper as a voiced to a voiceless sound, because the chords are not *stretched*, but only *brought nearer*, so as to narrow the glottis². Yet this spiritus lenis is so classified both by

¹ *Standard Alphabet*, p. 67.

² This is also Brücke's account, see *M. M.* 2, 128. It seems to me that the means by which the chordae vocales can be put into such a position as to produce sound are twofold; first, by the downward motion of the thyroid cartilage, by which the chords are necessarily stretched, and slightly approximate; secondly, by the closing of the two arytenoid cartilages, which necessarily bring the chords together, but need not necessarily stretch them, at least not so much as to make them vibrate clearly on the passage of a current of air. This I take to be the position intended in the text above.

In the account which I have given at page 64, that the hard sounds are produced without voice or vibration of the chordae vocales, while there is such voice when the soft sounds are produced, I have followed Brücke, the most eminent writer on the physiology of speech. Yet I cannot repress a suspicion that the difference between the two may after all be only one of degree, and not of kind, that there must be some approximation of the chordae even for hard letters. If the glottis be perfectly open, how do hard sounds differ from mere breath, which may be articulated in the mouth without ever producing a *k* or a *p*? It seems to me that for all consonants the edges of the chords must be approximated by the closing of the arytenoid cartilages, but approximated slightly for the hard and more completely for the soft consonants: perhaps in the latter case there is more of that perfect tension, caused by the action of the thyroid, which is doubtless necessary for the full vibration of the chords in vowel-sound. In this case the spiritus lenis would really stand to the spiritus asper exactly in the relation of a soft to a hard consonant, and Max Müller's arrangement would be justified.

CH. IV.

*Different
view of the
nature of
h.*

Lepsius¹ and by Max Müller: by the latter on the ground that "in pronouncing it more or less distinctly the breath is checked near the chordae vocales, and can be there intoned²."

A different view of the character of the H sound is given by Prof. Whitney and by Mr M. Bell: who working quite separately are in this matter in substantial accord. According to the former, "H is the corresponding surd to all those classes of sound which have not each its own special surd³." And the latter says⁴, "H is to the vowels exactly what P is to B, F to V, S to Z, &c.—a breath-variety of the same formations." Prof. Whitney will not allow that H when followed by a vowel has any independent existence: there is one position of the mouth, and *but one*, for what we commonly regard as *two* sounds in *ha*, *he*, *ho*, &c. He says⁵, "H is an anomalous member of the alphabet. Every other letter represents a distinct position of the organs of the mouth, through which alone it can be uttered: the *h* has no position of its own, but is uttered in the following letter. When we say *ha*, there is no shifting of place of the mouth organs, as we pass from the former to the latter sound: there is merely first an expiration of breath, then of sound, through the open throat.

But then Helmholtz's statement (which he quotes at 2, 131) that "the glottis is wide open with the tenues (hard letters) and therefore unable to sound" must be modified.

The double action upon the edges of the glottis mentioned above is not discriminated by the writers on linguistic science with whom I am acquainted; they also speak generally of "tension and approximation" as being necessary to sound, but without saying whether one is possible without the other. My own practical knowledge of the physiology of speech is very limited, being confined to the examination of specimens in the Cambridge Anatomical Museum, with the assistance and explanations kindly given by Prof. Humphry, and H. N. Martin, Esq. of Christ's College. So I only venture to make the above conjecture in a note whilst in the text I follow the received account. I notice that Prof. Huxley (*Elements*, p. 200) speaks of "parallelism of the edges of these chords," i.e. some approximation of them, as necessary to produce *any* sound; and the same is implied in the full account of the organs of speech given in Carpenter's *Physiology* (pp. 709—728), which however contains much that is quite erroneous about the actual sounds.

¹ p. 76.² II. 130.³ On Lepsius' Alphabet, p. 16, note.⁴ *Principles*, p. 38.⁵ *Ib.* p. 37.

So also when we pronounce *he* or *who*: the position of the tongue by which *i* is uttered, or that of the lips by which *u* is uttered, in those two words respectively, is taken up before the utterance of the *h*, not after it: there is again only a change from breath to sound as the material employed, no change as regards the oral modification to which the material is subjected." And the same conception is extended by both writers to the consonants: thus *hy* is regarded as the voiceless variety of *y*, just as *p* is of *b*. This theory seems to me more plausible with regard to the vowels than to the consonants. Yet even for the vowels, it will be observed that Prof. Whitney allows a change from breath to sound: he does not regard *ha* as simply a voiceless vowel: we have first breath, whence the aspiration; then sound, whence the *a*: but the position, he thinks, throughout is the same. I am no physiologist; but it appears to me quite conceivable that if the *h* be (according to Lepsius) a faucal consonant, it might be sounded so near to the glottis—the interval between the emission of the breath for the *h*, and the voice for the *a*, might be so short—that the change from consonantal action to vowel position might be imperceptible, and so the idea might erroneously be formed that the position for the *a* was taken up before any sound is uttered. This doubt of the priority of the vowel position is confirmed when I pass to the parallel variety assigned to the consonants, *hw* to *w*, &c. When the Indo-European *kwa* was changed to the Gothic *hwa*, our "who," did the Goths put their mouths into position for the *w* before making the sound which in this case is (on any hypothesis) a remnant of a self-existent *k*? A further difficulty presents itself to me. By this theory—which is beautifully symmetrical—a voiceless counterpart is provided for every voiced consonant which has not got one: *hy*, *hr*, &c. Then where the voiceless variety does exist, it ought to be identical in sound with the corresponding voiced sound preceded by *h*. But is this so? Is *hv*, for example, identical with *f*¹? No

doubt the aspiration may be made so strong that the difference disappears, but I think it is quite possible to sound *hva* distinct from *fa*. But this ought to be impossible if *h* has no independent existence, apart from the following sound. Again, what are we to say to those cases where *h* is final, as in Sanskrit? Here there is no vowel for it to be merged in. This argument, it is true, needs some limitation: although *h* occurs at the end of numerous Sanskrit bases, it is changed in all the cases of the noun which occur in actual use by the addition of the suffixes: e.g. the base *Kāmaduh* becomes in the nom. *Kāmaduk*, acc. *Kāmaduham*, &c., and probably even the vocative, which generally is the pure base, here, as in some other cases, follows the nominative. So also many roots end in *h*, but when they appear as verbs the *h* is never final². The Indian *visarga* too, which is not *h* but a very weak aspiration, taking the place of final *s* under certain conditions, is now at least barely audible: Prof. M. Williams compares the evanescent sound of *s* in French in such words as *les*. Still it is perfectly possible to sound *h* final in India; and I am assured by Prof. Cowell, that the difference, e.g., between *va* and *vah* in the mouth of a Pandit is perfectly distinct. But this again would be impossible, if *h* is only implied in a following letter³.

I incline to the old belief that *h* is a genuine conso-

¹ *F* is voiceless, corresponding to *v* which is voiced.

² Prof. Cowell tells me that in Bengali, where the *a* final in Sanskrit names is regularly dropped (e.g. *Rām* for *Rāma*), it is retained after *h* alone.

³ Prof. Whitney has discussed these objections at some length in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London), 1873—4, pp. 321—3. I must refer those who are interested in the matter to his own statement of his opinions: I regret that I have so far misunderstood him before as to combat (in part) what is not his view but Mr Bell's: as against Mr Bell it may still stand. Prof. Whitney's own doctrine is to my mind much more incredible, if I understand it rightly: in *hva* he considers that the *h* was "a breath through the position of the *w*:" that is, I suppose *hva* = *hw* + *w* + *a*. Similarly *h* at the end of a word "is pronounced in the position of its predecessor instead of its successor: the *h* of *ih* is like that of *hi*, that of *uh*, like that of *hu* and so on: except so far as it is thickened into a *ch*-sound, it has no place of its own when final

nant, though produced extremely near the glottis, in consequence of which it readily combines so much with a following vowel, as to seem to be produced in the same act. I also think that there may be a soft *h*, which differs from the ordinary *h* almost, if not quite as much, as any soft consonant differs from the corresponding hard: and that this soft *h* differed infinitesimally (if at all¹) from the breath heard after the momentary sound in the original aspirates.

Next in order come the undoubted consonants *K*, *G*, and *NG*. These are formed by bringing the root of the tongue against the soft palate. The position of the organs within the mouth is the same for all: the difference between *K* and *G* has been already mentioned: one is formed out of breath, the other out of voice. In sounding *NG*, as in the other nasals, the soft palate is lowered so as to uncover the end of the nasal tubes in the pharynx. It differs from them in that all the voice passes through the nostrils; whilst in *n* and *m* much escapes by the mouth. The reason of this is that the check is applied as far back in the mouth as possible. Since then there is a perfectly open passage through the nasal tubes, *NG* is almost a vowel: still it cannot be considered as absolutely complete until the mouth-organs are separated. There is a want of distinctness, if the sound is terminated not by separating the palate and tongue, but by closing the windpipe². This sound is very common in English, especially at the end of a word: which is the cause why the French nasal vowels (*en*, *on*, &c.) constantly receive this sound from Englishmen. If the tongue be kept in the same position, but in looser contact with the palate, so as to produce continuous sounds, we get a central pair (voiceless and voiced) not

(ii.) back-palatals, or "gutturals," *k*, *g*, *ng*, *ch* (Germ.), *g* (Germ.).

any more than when initial." I certainly retain my belief that *h* in such a case has a distinct position of its own, which is not that of *i* or *u*, and which need not be that of *ch*, though from being a more difficult sound and produced farther back it may be changed into *ch*.

¹ See note on page 69.

² *Principles*, p. 50.

CH. IV.

occurring in English, but in the German *Bach* and *Tage*: for the corresponding lateral sounds, Mr Bell can suggest nothing but the hiss of wildfowl (voiceless), and a Gaelic *l* (voiced). None of these continuous sounds were Indo-European. This class is commonly, though not correctly, called *guttural*. A more correct term would be Back-palatal: but the old term will be retained as well known and convenient.

(iii.) *mid-*
dle-pala-
tals," or
"palatals,"
ch (?), *j* (?),
ç, *ch*
(Germ.
soft), *y*,

The next class is formed by the middle of the tongue against the hard palate. Strange to say, it is doubted whether any momentary sounds belong to this class. In Sanskrit we find *ch* and *j*, which are now pronounced as in English *cheer* and *jeer*. Nearly all physiologists are agreed that these are double sounds: that *ch*=*tsh* and *j*=*dzh*. Consequently, Prof. Lepsius is certain that the old Sanskrit pronunciation must have been different, since none but single sounds were represented in Devanâgarî by single symbols. What this single sound may have been he does not suggest: but he puts a symbol for it into his alphabet (*k'*, the same which is commonly used for the modern sound). It may have been something like that heard in the vulgar English "kyind" for kind, where the parasitic *y* turns the *k* into something between *ch* and *k*: and in all languages where the sound *ch* occurs, it has been formed from *k* by some such corruption; *cha* (Sk.) is from original *ka* (Lat. *que*), just as English "church" is from "kirk," and the Italian *cima* shews its origin by its spelling. I am not however sure that the English *ch* is necessarily a compound sound. It has a constant tendency to become so, by prefixing a parasitic *t*: but I believe that it is possible to pronounce it pure: and that this pure sound may be the Sanskrit *ch*. It seems to me impossible that there should be no momentary sound between *k* and *t*, and some evidence that such a sound existed will be given in the next chapter. The nasal of this class is found in the Asiatic languages; it was sounded probably as the *gn* in Italian "Campagna." The continuous sounds are numerous

in this class. If the contact be made slightly but without varying the position from that for *ch*, we get a voiceless sound, which is heard in the German *ich*, and is at least not unlike the initial sound of our "hew" (i.e. hyoo): the voiced sound is the common *y* of "yew." To this class also must be referred the much-discussed Sanskrit palatal *s*, written as *ṣ* by most English writers on Sanskrit, as *ṣ* by Lepsius, as *ç* by others: I prefer the last symbol as pointing to the historical fact, that this sound, like that of *ch* and *j*, was corrupted from the gutturals. As Lepsius observes, Englishmen in sounding the German *ch* in "ich," &c. frequently produce a sibilant instead. If, therefore, we pronounce that *ch* as well as we can expect to do, we shall pretty nearly pronounce the Sanskrit *ç*. These continuous sounds are all central: there are no lateral sounds¹ of this class, which should correctly be called Middle-palatal, but for convenience may be called Palatal simply. Of all its members only *y* seems to be Indo-European.

From this class the natural transition would seem to be to a Front-palatal class, formed by the tip of the tongue. But there are sounds which lie between the two classes. Thus it is possible to raise the tongue to the whole of the middle and front of the palate: and thus we get—no momentary—but the continuous sounds *S* and *Z* as in "advice" (*s*) and "advise" (*z*). These letters are commonly regarded as dentals. In reality however if the tip of the tongue once touch the teeth the sound is no longer *s* but *th*, in fact a lisp is produced². A very slight modification of this position gives the pair *Sh* and *Zh*, as in sure (*sh*), pleasure (*zh*). For these the middle part of the tongue is not so much raised, and the point is drawn back: the

(iv.) mixed-palatals, *s*, *z*, *sh*, *zh*,

¹ Mr Bell assigns the two English sounds of *Th* (*þ* and *ð*) to this class as laterals on the ground that the middle of the tongue (he rather deceivingly calls the middle the front) is raised in pronouncing them. To me the position of the middle of the tongue seems to be unimportant—in Max Müller's diagram (2. 134) it is even slightly depressed—and the tip to be the only necessary agent. See below, p. 78. It is however quite possible to sound them with the middle of the tongue raised.

² *Principles*, p. 182.

CH. IV.

aperture is therefore somewhat increased. There is no natural tendency however of *s* to pass into *sh* except under assimilating influence, e. g. when a German says "shtein" for "stein." Out of this class the voiceless *s* is Indo-European¹. The best name for these sounds would be Mixed-palatals, but the difference being only slight, they are always classified with the Front-palatals; but it should be remembered that they are properly sounded farther back in the mouth.

(v.) *lin-*
guals or
cerebrals,
t, d, n, s,

But we are not yet past the middle palate: though the class of which we have to speak need not detain us long. I mean the Indian Linguals, or Cerebrals—neither name quite describes them—which are said to be sounded by bringing the lower surface of the tongue against the roof of the palate. Practically then the agents in their production are the tip of the tongue and the middle of the palate. The sounds are four, *ṭ, ḍ, ṇ, ṣ*; the dot beneath them is the diacritical mark of Lepsius and most other philologists. Their history is tolerably clear: they arise from the simpler *T, D, &c.*, primarily through the influence of a neighbouring *r*²: afterwards the cerebrals, so produced, themselves spread the infection. The *r* itself was lost in so doing; e. g. *karta* became *kāṭa*, or, more rarely, assimilated as in *bhattā* for *bhartā*. Now in pronouncing *r* the tip of the tongue is bent slightly back, almost exactly as I have described it above. If then after sounding this *r*, the tongue be kept in the same position instead of being moved forward to the ordinary position for *t*, the result is *ṭ*; but the contact being complete for *t* instead of being imperfect for *r*, the stronger letter forced the weaker out. The change from *t* to *ṭ* must certainly

¹ The diagram given by Max Müller for *sh* differs considerably from Mr Bell's; it is very like his diagram for *r*, except that the point of the tongue is not fully raised. So far as I am able to judge, Mr Bell's seems the more exact of the two.

² See Bühler's Essay, epitomised in Ferrar's *Comp. Grammar*; where many illustrations are given.

appear to be from an easier to a more difficult sound ; but when *t* is regarded as the single result of the compound *rt*, the change will cease to surprise us. The sound of *s* differs very slightly from our *sh* already described ; the tongue must be drawn a very little farther back, and the point slightly raised.

We now come to the Front-palatals, generally called Dentals. In not one of them however is the tongue commonly pressed against the teeth, though variations of them may be formed in that way : but the point of the tongue is brought against the front of the palate immediately behind the gums. Thus we get our English *T*, *D*, and *N*, all shut sounds, for which the mouth is in the same position. Not very different is that for our continuous central *R*, as in "row ;" in which the tip is brought close to the palate, but without absolute contact, so that the air passes over it¹. The difference between this sound and that heard in most modern languages is the absence of vibration, or at all events the very slight motion. In this respect English agrees with Sanskrit : where the vowel *ri* is more like the vibrated or trilled *r*. It is a voiced sound : the voiceless *r* being heard by Mr Bell in the French "théâtre," &c. Exactly corresponding to the central *R* is the lateral *L*. If, instead of obstructing the breath at the sides of the mouth, so that the current of air passes only over the point, we press the point firmly against the palate just as in *T*, *D*, but (not as in those sounds) prevent the tongue from pressing against the sides of the mouth, then we get *L*. Here, as has often been pointed out, the configuration of the mouth is so open as almost to constitute a vowel, but the sound is completed by the withdrawal of the tongue, and so comes under the definition of a consonant². Like *r* it is a voiced letter, but here again Mr Bell detects a

(vi.) front-palatals or "dentals,"
t, d, n
(English),
r, l,

¹ The sound of *r* in words like *are*, *our*, &c. is different from this, and will be described afterwards. It is a "glide;" see the account of the vowels.

² *Principles*, p. 194.

CH. IV.

t, d, n
(Sanskrit),

þ (th), ʒ
(*dh*),

voiceless *l* in French "temple¹." *R* is Indo-European: perhaps also *L*.

Genuine dentals are found in Sanskrit. The Sanskrit *T*, *D*, and *N* are pronounced by bringing the tip of the tongue not against the palate, but against the edge of the upper teeth. This is the reason why the Hindus transcribe our dentals by their cerebrals, e. g. *direktar*, for Director²: not that the cerebrals exactly correspond, but because they are nearer our sounds than the true dentals are. In fact the Indian *t* and *d* are the momentary sounds, corresponding to our continuous sounds *þ* and *ʒ* (*Th* and *Dh*): and beginners are advised (I am told by Prof. Cowell) to pronounce at first the Hindu *t* by our *th*, as a less error, and to obviate the certain confusion caused by using our own *t*. I do not know whether the dental or the palatal *t* and *d* was the original Indo-European sound: but probably the latter. There are no central continuous dentals: indeed their formation is clearly impossible. But *þ* and *ʒ* are lateral dentals. Here the contact between the teeth and the tongue is only complete in the centre, and the breath escapes over the sides of the tongue. It is unimportant whether the central part of the tongue be kept sunk or not: if it be raised, as has already been pointed out, the position is the same as for *s*, except that the point of the tongue touches the teeth, while in *s* it does not. The sound of *þ* (the Anglo-Saxon "Thorn") is that of *th* in English *thin* and modern Greek *θ*, where it is probably corrupted from an aspirate *t'h*. The sound of *ʒ* (A. S. "Edh") is heard in *then*, and is also that of Danish *d* (in certain cases), of Spanish *d* and modern Greek *δ*. Neither sound is Indo-European: neither is found in Sanskrit, or

¹ *Visible Speech*, p. 93. In *Principles &c.*, p. 57, he considered that the Welsh *ll* was this voiceless sound; but in his later work he gives *ll* a mixed origin, from the point and middle of the tongue both raised as in *sh*; but differing from that articulation in that the sound is lateral.

² Max Müller, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 8.

in Zend (except very rarely after *r* or *w*¹); they are curiously sporadic developments of the West.

The next class is called the Labiodental. It consists of but two lateral continuous sounds—our English *F* and *V*. In producing these the upper teeth are pressed upon the lower lip, the air escaping between the sides of the lip and the teeth. The pronunciation of these letters will require considerable discussion when we come to the account of Greek and Latin variations. The sound of *v*, which is now heard “in England, France, North Germany, India,” &c., is generally supposed to have been Indo-European: but it is questionable whether that letter did not really fall under the next class.

Lastly, we have the Labial class—that formed by both the lips. The shut sounds are *P*, *B*, *M*. As in the case of the other nasals, the mouth is in precisely the same position and deals with the same material for *m* as for *b*: but, as was pointed out above, the mouth must be filled with air in sounding *m*, whereas in sounding *ng* almost the whole passes to the nostrils. Accordingly, whilst a tolerably clear *ng* can be produced without removal of the tongue from the back palate, only a very indistinct *m* is heard without the parting of the lips. The continuous central labial is *w*, which is voiced; as has been already said, a voiceless *w* is perhaps heard in the common English sound *wh* (i.e. *hw*). In sounding *w* the inner edges of the lips are put closely together, and the sound issues through an aperture in the centre; the position is the same as for *u*. It is indeed possible (as Mr Bell points out³) to pronounce *w* with a lateral as well as with a central opening: but the position is a very constrained one. The close affinity of this letter to *u*, and the ease with which the one sound is converted into the other in all languages, are strong arguments for assigning this rather than the labiodental *v*-sound to the original language.

(vii.) labio-dentals, *f*, *v* (English),

(viii.) labials, *p*, *b*, *m*, *hw*, *w*, *f* (?), *v* (central Germ.).

¹ Haug's *Grammar*, p. 16.

² Lepsius, p. 75.

³ *Principles*, p. 53.

CH. IV.

There is however a truly labial pair of sounds, *f* and *v*, distinct from the labiodentals with the same symbols. These are formed by bringing the *outer* edges of the lips together, while the breath escapes laterally. The voiced *v* is heard in Central Germany, e.g. in *weg*, and is also the sound of the Spanish *b*, and of the modern Greek β . This fact will be seen to have an important bearing on the question of the true sound of the Latin *v*. According to Mr Bell's diagram¹ there is a further difference between this *v* and the English *w*: this *v* is simply labial, the tongue lying at absolute rest in the bottom of the mouth: but in *w* the back of the tongue is almost in the position for sounding the back palatals. I do not know any language in which the labial *f* occurs.

We have thus traced the course of the breath or voice in the formation of consonants through the whole length of the air-tube from the glottis to the outer edge of the lips. The only remaining sound commonly heard in modern speech is the vibrated *r*, the rough trill: the formation of which has been sufficiently described already². The results are given in the accompanying table. It remains now to be seen how far these physiological considerations can supply us with any scale of sounds, ranged accordingly to the difficulty of their production, which may throw light on the changes which we shall find to have taken place in Greek and Latin. I do not propose to lay down any absolute and invariable scale, and to say, this sound is universally more difficult than that, and therefore this or that change took place in Greek and Latin. I shall hereafter describe the process of change in each language as it is historically traceable. But I believe that each and every change had a reason; whether that reason was some peculiarity (as no doubt it generally was) of the special people, or whether it was some physiological fact which is of much wider and more general application. Let us see whether such facts can be obtained from the details given

General
rules to
determine
the strength
of sounds.

¹ *Visible Speech*, p. 63.

² At page 68.

Names according to Organs employed.		Faucal		Back Palatal		Central Palatal		Mixed Palatal		Cerebral or Lingual		Front Palatal		Dental		Labio-dental		Labial			
Palate				back		central		central and front		central		front									
Tongue		back		back		middle		middle and point		point		point		point							
Teeth														upper		upper					
Lip																lower		inner edges outer edges			
Momentary	Shut Central Lateral Vibrated			K KH	G GH	Ch (?)	J (?)			T TH	D DH	English { N	T TH	D DH	Sanskrit { N			P PH	B BH		
					NG		Ñ				N			N					M		
Continuous			H	Soft H(?)	Ch ("nach")	G ("tage")	Ch ("ich")	Y	S {Sh (less of each	Z Zh (less of each)	S				R (English)			Hw	W		
														L		p (th)	ɣ (th for dh)	F	V	F	V
					North-umbrian burr German uvula- vibration				R (Scotch and French)												
Received Names		Guttural				Palatal		Dental		Cerebral		Dental				Labio-dental		Labial			

above. It is quite possible that we may interpret those details wrongly, or apply right conclusions erroneously. If so, it is only to be hoped that subsequent research may set us right¹.

First of all, we may assert with confidence that a momentary sound is stronger than a continuous one, and therefore we may expect to find, as we actually do, that a momentary sound passes into a continuous one, but not vice versa, except from some assimilating influence which is sufficient to explain the apparent irregularity. It is clear from the nature of the sounds that the complete check given for a moment to the breath must require a stronger effort on the part of the organs of speech, than is needed where there is no perfect stoppage, but the stream of air is suffered to flow on in a slightly altered current until it is exhausted; just as the mill-dam endures a more violent pressure than the breakwater over which the stream rushes.

It is quite true that a protractible sound may be made more difficult than a momentary one by extreme prolongation. A smaller effort extended over a longer time may be made more than equivalent in labour to a greater effort lasting a shorter time². The effort required for any sound may be greatly varied at will by the same man. Even for momentary sounds the check may be made more intense by expelling the air from the lungs by a violent jerk; and continuous sounds (as I have said) may be greatly prolonged so as to increase the effort greatly. But it should never be forgotten that in ordinary conversation people are not experimenting on the powers of sounds: they speak with a very slightly varying ratio of power for each sound, subject to special modifications for emphasis; and these affect the vowels principally, though the consonants

Momentary sounds stronger than protractible.

¹ In this (third) edition I have considerably expanded the following discussion and endeavoured to meet objections to it. Some statements, which I now think no longer tenable, have been withdrawn: and sometimes a second explanation has been given as at least possible.

² This is rightly pointed out by Mr Fennell. (*Attempt*, &c. p. 24).

CH. IV.

may also be varied to an appreciable degree. Obviously in protracting any sound beyond its normal length for each man we have an exertion of will: a man is willing to make a certain effort for a certain purpose. But I have nothing to do with such cases: I am dealing with the variations of every-day speech in which we are not thinking of the relative strength of sound¹. In speaking without special stress the rule which I have given above holds good.

It is sometimes objected that children learn to articulate momentary sounds sooner than protracted ones: and that therefore they must be more easy, not more difficult. I do not think this objection valid. The production of momentary sounds is not a super-infantile difficulty. It may be² that they result from more distinct positions of the organs of speech and are therefore apprehended more easily: and the production of all sounds is simply a matter of learning—an effort of the will which commonly prevents that corruption of sounds of which we are speaking. The point maintained is that when both sounds—momentary and protracted—have been acquired, the second class is practically found to require less effort than the first.

So in the infancy of the race it was natural that the explosive sounds should be acquired first, then by degrees the others were produced, many of them, as we have seen, only after the sundering of the parent family. There is nothing in all this to shew that *f* and *v* are not easier sounds than *p* and *b* after both classes have been apprehended.

Next, among the momentary sounds, what is the relation of the hard to the soft, each in its own class? The difference of effort in producing the two sounds is hardly perceptible. Physiologically we have seen that the dif-

*Hard
sounds
apparently
stronger
than soft,
each in*

¹ Neglect of this obvious principle seems to me to have led Mr Fennell to enunciate some undeniable axioms, which do not affect the argument.

² Whitney, *l. l.* p. 321.

their own
class: but
this is un-
certain.

ference between them is this; a greater rush of air passes through the glottis for the hard than for the soft sound, because the glottis is at least more open for the first class; whether it be entirely open or not¹ is not material. It is barely conceivable that this greater rush is caused by greater initial velocity for each hard sound than for each soft one. But, whatever be the cause of it, greater effort is needed to check the fuller column of air, though not so much greater as to be necessarily perceptible. It is not necessary that man should consciously economise his labour at each utterance: it is sufficient for my principle that he should consciously or unconsciously form such habits as actually involve the least expenditure of muscular energy, even where the saving may be infinitesimally small. It is however possible that the action of the muscles, which partially close the glottis for each soft consonant, may neutralise this small saving of labour in the mouth organs. It cannot be proved that this is not so²: and therefore this explanation, which I formerly gave as the only one, I now consider doubtful. It is possible that the change from hard to soft letters (not a very common one in either Greek or Latin) may be due, as Prof. Whitney thinks³, to the assimilating effect of the adjoining vowels, which are soft. The same explanation, so far as medial consonants are concerned, has been put forward independently by Mr Fennell, but it seems equally applicable to initial consonants followed by vowels: when followed by a soft consonant, as is most commonly the case (e.g. *gracilis*, where *k* is the original sound), the change is clearly due to assimilation. If vowels have the same effect, the cause is one throughout, and comes, equally as before, under the general principle of phonetic change, though acting in a different way—by assimilation, not mere substitution. There must be some physiological reason to explain the fact that in almost every language

¹ See page 69, note.

² Fennell, *l.c.* p. 21.

³ *l.c.* p. 324.

CH. IV.

the hard passes into the soft, so far as change between them takes place at all. The only exceptions I know are that part of the Teutonic *Lautverschiebung*, or "shifting of sound," by which *g* becomes *k*, *d* becomes *t*, and *b* becomes *p*: and a certain tendency in the same direction in modern Welsh, not, I think, in the older Keltic, e.g. to pronounce "God" as *Cot*. Sometimes we find savages who pronounce no soft sounds at all, only hard ones: but this is different. I grant the difficulty of the Teutonic change, and can only account for it as an instance of the striving for distinctness¹, which sometimes acts counter to the principle of phonetic change. It may possibly be due to admixture of race.

Unaspirated sounds stronger than the corresponding aspirates.

Next, the aspirate is weaker than the corresponding unaspirated letter. This follows from the nature of the aspirates, of which I have already said something², and shall have more to say hereafter: the breath heard in each case follows upon less permanent, that is, less strong, contact. On this theory it no longer seems unnatural that the more voluminous *kh* should be weaker than *k*, or *gh* than *g*. But when the sound denoted here by *h* became at last, as I believe it did, not a subsidiary breath, but an independent sound, the spiritus asper; then *kh*, *gh*, &c. must be treated as compounds, subject to the ordinary influences which affect compounds, such as loss of one of the members, or assimilation of one member by the other. This is the reason why, though *gh* be weaker than *g*, we can yet find in Latin, and perhaps in Greek, *g* in the place of original *gh*: e.g. *ang-ustus* from Indo-European AGH; *gh* has become a double sound, and the *h* has been dropped from the end of the compound. That the aspirates were in their origin later than the unaspirated letters, can be best seen in Sanskrit³—a language which especially deserves our thanks for performing within historical times so many of the oldest processes of language.

What now is the relation of one hard to another hard?

Of the different

¹ See Chapter I. p. 4: and v. note 1.

² See p. 65.

³ *Ib.*

*classes the
gutturals
are the
strongest.*

What law of strength governs the exchange which we sometimes find between one class and another, guttural and dental, dental and labial, &c.? Where there is a complete check, the rule seems to be absolute that their strength is less as their distance from the lungs is greater; that is, that the gutturals are stronger than the palatals (in those languages which possess palatals), the palatals than the dentals and the labials: and this is the order of the consonants given by the acute Indian grammarians, doubtless intentionally. The current of air is strongest at the outset, and gradually grows weaker. Therefore the minimum effort required to stop it at the lips is less than in the throat: in other words, a labial is naturally a weaker sound than a guttural. Next, the muscular effort required to put the mouth into the position for sounding *k* will generally be allowed by those who have tried, to be greater than that required for *p*; though no positive proof of this is possible. For these two reasons we must expect *k* to pass into *p*, but never without strong reason allow that *p* can pass into *k*. Here again the Sanskrit stands us in good stead by its greater number of consonants. The theory, that the guttural *k* is naturally the strongest of all sounds, is borne out by the fact that *k* actually passes into the palatal *ch* but not *ch* into *k*: when we have the double form in a group of Sanskrit words, we find regularly *k* in corresponding words of other languages; so that *ch* is clearly a Sanskrit weakening. The common substitution by children of dentals for gutturals is another argument for the greater strength of the latter class. This is not (so far as my experience goes) because the child is unable or has not learnt to sound a guttural: but because of the greater muscular difficulty of the position. Indeed a few children sound gutturals before they sound dentals: but I never heard a child substitute a guttural for a dental¹. Lastly, they hardly appear in terminations, where

¹ Mr Fennell's explanation of this habit in children is untenable. He is arguing (p. 29) that language is learnt by imitation, and that a

CH. IV.

ease of sound is most important: or when they do, yet never as the second element of a consonantal group, not *tk*, *dg* but *kt*, *gd*: this argument indeed cannot be pressed to its full result, for we find in terminations *pt* and *bd*, as well as *kt* and *gd*, so that by this reasoning *p* and *b* ought to be stronger sounds than *t* and *d*. But the reason here seems to be that labials, which require perfect closing of the lips, are ill suited for the end of a word, where we instinctively prefer those sounds in which the breath is not articulated by the lips, as among the vowels *e* rather than either *o* or *u*. Probably indeed dentals and labials do not differ much in strength, but still, in the few cases of exchange, it is the dental that seems to pass into the labial.

*Different
explanation
given
by Prof.
Whitney.*

Prof. Whitney gives a different account of the immediate cause of these changes, which deserves consideration. "The principle of ease," he says¹, "is a true one, but it requires to be put in a different form. In themselves, as articulations, the extreme sounds are as easy as the medial ones²—if anything, easier: their sharper and broader differences are more readily apprehended, their decided articulating positions more readily caught and imitated. When however they come to be put together in connected and rapid utterance, with constant transition from vowel to consonant, and from consonant to vowel, the case is somewhat changed. Experience teaches (unconsciously, of course) that the transitions from very open to very close positions are longer and more difficult, that they require a greater expenditure of muscular

guttural changes to a labial because the eye assists the ear. This ingenious explanation may have some truth in it; though I do not believe that children learn actual sounds by watching the lips of their elders. But be that as it may, the corruption of gutturals by children is not in the least explained thereby. A child says "det" instead of "get": and does not say "bet." Imitation has no place here.

¹ *Trans. l. c.* p. 320.

² These terms refer to Prof. Whitney's arrangement of all sounds in three lines, each beginning with *a* and passing to the momentary consonants K, T, P, respectively, through the cognate vowels semi-vowels and other protracted sounds. See note on p. 62.

force than the transitions between more medial positions of the organs; and the tongue gradually finds out for itself those medial positions. It is thus the combination and collision of open vowel and close consonant, in the rapid utterance of the practised speaker, that tends toward a modification in the line of less distinction, toward the production, as substitutes, of sounds in which the mouth organs have a less distance to traverse in going from one to the other. The consonants and vowels become to a certain extent assimilated to one another; the consonant is vocalized, that is to say, made opener in position; and the vowel is consonantized, that is, made closer in position. And the intermediate places of the alphabetic system are filled up with medial sounds, which, though even harder in themselves, are an aid to the fluency of continuous speech, and which the child therefore is forced to learn from the example of the older and more rapid speaker." That is to say, the changes which have been described as simple substitutions—of a protracted sound for a momentary one, of a soft sound for a hard, of an aspirated sound for an unaspirated—are examples rather of assimilation on a very large scale, though none the less the result of economizing muscular effort. To this theory little *a priori* objection can be taken. It is not indeed clear, upon Prof. Whitney's own arrangement, e. g. of the guttural line—*a, a_e, e, i, y, ñ, h, zh, sh, g (gh), k*—in which *a* and *k* are the extremes, why *a* should not pass into *y*, or *k* into *i*, since there is no essential difference in character between the vowels and consonants in the line. But this theory does not explain the transition of sounds belonging to one line into sounds belonging to another—of *k*, one extreme, into *t*, another extreme: and, it may be observed here, Prof. Whitney's three lines are insufficient to express the physical distinction of consonants; thus he includes *y, sh, and zh* among gutturals: which they certainly are not: so that the number of changes left unexplained is greater than would at first appear. However, there may be a

CH. IV.

General
rules
hardly
possible
for con-
tinuous
sounds.

Among the
nasals *m*
may be
stronger
than *n*.

Of the spi-
rants, *y* is
the strong-
est;

h is the
weakest in
Greek.

S is strong-
er than *r*.

different cause for these latter changes, and Prof. Whitney's theory may be still true for the first three kinds.

I have thus set forth the sort of changes we must expect to find among momentary sounds or between momentary and continuous sounds. For the continuous sounds themselves it is less easy to lay down rules. They are in their nature much less definite than the momentary; and much depends on the length of time during which they are sounded: the action of the will has more play in their case than for the momentary sound which cannot be prolonged: therefore the exchange between them is more irregular and varies more in different languages. The nasals, as we have seen, are to some extent dependent on other stronger consonants; the guttural nasal indeed not often standing single. Curtius thinks that where we find *m* and *n* in corresponding words the *m* is the stronger. But most of his examples (e.g. *δόμον* but *domum*, Sanskrit *damam*, and the German *Faden* for old *Fadem*) are of final *m*, which, like other labials, is inconvenient at the end of a word. If we assume the strength of the spirants in the order of their pronunciation, we should get *y*, *s*, *v*, which is probably correct, but they do not seem to interchange much. Certainly neither of the last two ever passes into *y*; and Curtius thinks even the few cases where we find *ϕ* on inscriptions instead of original *y*, e.g. *φότι*, are pure mistakes in writing; it being known that some letter had dropped, and more trace of *v* having been left than of *y*. The history of *h* differs for different languages. In Greek it is always the remnant of one of the spirants, and weaker than any of them; in Latin it has replaced *gh*, and seems to have been pretty strongly sounded. *S* and *r* are pronounced alike with the point of the tongue; but in *s* the back of the tongue is also employed; in *r* (at least in English *r*) the point of the tongue alone is raised to the front of the palate: for the vibrated *r*, the tongue is in very much the same position as for *s*, but (ex hypothesi) is held much more loosely. Whichever then was

the sound of the Latin *r*, or the Laconian *ρ*, we can understand the transition from *s* to those sounds.

Central sounds appear to be more difficult than lateral. Here we should not feel sure of the fact from physiology, but the regular change of *r* into *l*, and *s* into *th*, is convincing. Where *l* has become *r* in modern Italian or French, the cause is probably dissimilation, as in old Latin: e.g. in "apôtre," for apostole; here the *l*, a lateral sound, which requires a central closure, was more difficult than a central one immediately after the central opening of *t*. *R* and *l* are pronounced at the same part of the palate; *s* and *th* are not so; but a looser *th* can be sounded without putting the tongue against the edge of the teeth, by laying the back of the tongue against the roof of the palate—not the mere point, which would produce *l*¹. In this *th*, the tongue may indeed touch the teeth, but this is not essential to the sound (as for the proper *th*). Prof. Huxley tells² of a man whose tongue had been amputated, who could yet sound *th*: the contact must have been given by the stump of the tongue against the edge of the palate. *S* may however pass into the true *th*, if in sounding it the tongue be allowed to touch the teeth, because then central contact takes place, and the sound must be emitted laterally.

With respect to continuous labials I know no general rule that can be given. I think no language has more than one pair of them. *R* passes into *w* in lisping, which agrees with the natural order of the sounds; which order holds, as a rule, for continuous as well as for momentary sounds. But as they are less firm than momentary sounds there is more scope for assimilation, which may neutralise the common order.

¹ It is this *th* probably which is oftenest substituted for *s* in lisping; and for which *s* is substituted, if such substitution ever takes place, which I greatly doubt. The instance "says for sayeth" (Prof. Mayor, l.c. p. 335) is, I think, an error; the two forms were distinct: "sayis" or "sayes" is old North English, both sing. and plur.; to which in old South English "saith" corresponds; though later "sayen" was the plural in use.

² *Elem. of Phys.*, p. 203.

Central sounds more difficult than lateral.

R passes into w.

CH. IV.

Classifica-
tion of
vowels.

It is more difficult to determine with exactness the true sound of vowels than of consonants. For many consonants there can be little or no variation : in whatever lands *p* and *b* are sounded they must be sounded at the same place ; there can be no great range for *k* and *g* ; and so on. The points too of contact, which give distinct difference of sound, are limited. But we can never be sure that we have obtained all the varieties of vowel-sound : they are unlimited. For our purpose however it is sufficient to point out the best marked points in the scale, in the assurance that if some of the Greek and Latin vowels did not exactly coincide with any of these, the difference could not have been great. As I said at the beginning, all vowels must be pronounced as in Italian, except English sounds which are given as examples in brackets ; e.g. (ee) denotes the *i* sound. It is to be remembered that vowels are various *open positions* of the vocal tube, modifying in various ways the breath which has received tone from the vibration of the stretched chordæ vocales.

The two most important vowel classifications, with which I am acquainted, are those of Prof. Lepsius, and Mr Melville Bell. They differ considerably : that of Prof. Lepsius is best suited to render plain the historical development of vowel-sound in Greece and Italy, and will in the main be followed here. But Mr Bell's system is important in many ways, and as I shall take a good deal from it, it will be best briefly to describe it first.

Vowels and
glides.

Mr Bell recognises in all thirty-six vowel sounds, and twelve "glides," the latter being "*transitional*" sounds, which differ from consonants, in that the vocal tube is so open that there is no friction in the mouth : they would therefore be vowels, if they had any "fixed configuration," any permanent position ; but they are sounded too short for this, and are essentially incapable of being prolonged. They principally occur as one of the two elements of a diphthong, and in this character they will come under our notice later on. Glides in English are frequent : thus the

y at the end of "day," is certainly not a full consonant; nor is it a vowel, for it cannot be prolonged: it is a "transitional" sound between the two. Other examples are the *w* in "now," the *r* in "are," and "our:" the slight prolongation of vowel-sound heard between *a* and *r* in "va'ry," &c.¹

CH. IV.

Of the thirty-six vowels, nine are primary; that is, possessing the smallest opening of the vocal tube necessary to distinguish them from consonants. Three of these are formed with the back of the tongue, and so the position of the mouth does not differ much from that for *k* and *g*: these are called "back" vowels. Three are "front" vowels: for these the back of the tongue is raised to the arch of the palate, much as for *y*. The other three are called "mixed," because they combine the properties of each of these classes, being formed with the back of the tongue, but with the edges also raised to the sides of the teeth. The three vowels in each of these three classes are called "high," "mid," and "low," respectively, according to the degrees of elevation of the tongue. Thus, for example, the English (ee) in "eel," is technically called a "high front" vowel; the (u) in "up" is a "back mid," while the vowel of the French "que" is a "mixed mid²." Next, we have nine modifications of these primary vowels, called "wide" vowels. In these, "the resonance cavity is enlarged behind the configurative aperture³," by drawing back the soft palate and expanding the pharynx. By doing this, for example, when the tongue is in the same position as for sounding "eel," we get "ill"—a "high-front-wide," instead of a "high-front" vowel. Instead however of the terms "primary," and "wide," I shall use the terms "close," and "open," for these two classes respectively, as being already in use in some languages to express, I believe, the same distinction. Lastly, each one of these eighteen vowels may be modified in a further way—

I. Nine
"primary"
or "close"
vowels.

(i) Three
"back,"

(ii) three
"front,"

(iii) three
"mixed,"

and cross-
wise, three
"high,"
three
"mid," and
three
"low."

II. Nine
"wide" or
"open"
vowels,
modifica-
tions of
the nine
close
vowels.

III. Eigh-
teen
"round"

¹ *Visible Speech*, p. 69 and 94.

² See the Table at page 92.

³ *Ib.* p. 71.

		Round					
		Back	Mixed	Front	Back	Mixed	Front
Low	Open	āh män (Scotch)	err	an man (Engl.)	on Poll	-or	
	Close			ell	all Paul		"beurre"
Middle	Open	ask	-al	air pair. Ital. open e	ore "chaud" pour Ital. open o	-ory	"jeu" "Göthe"
	Close	up	"que"	day pail Ital. close e	home pole	"homme"	"une"
High	Open	-tion	-es	ill pill	poor pull Ital. close o	-ure	
	Close			ēel "il" peel	pōol "cōupé"		"über"

This table is taken from *Visible Speech*, p. 94, with two differences. I have employed the terms "open" and "close," instead of Mr Bell's "wide" and "primary;" and I have exhibited the "Low," "Middle," and "High" letters together. The examples *above* the line in such divisions are Mr Bell's own; in a few cases however I have substituted examples, which he has elsewhere given, instead of some American and Cockney variations which he gives in this Table. I am responsible for everything *below* the line in each division. Where the space is blank, there is no English sound to give and none in dialectical English or foreign languages which seemed to me important for my present object. If indeed I had been consistent I should have omitted all the English final syllables which are so acutely distinguished by Mr Bell: but I thought it worth while to include all English variations which could be discriminated by any ear.

thus giving us the whole thirty-six. The external sign of this modification is a contraction or "rounding" of the aperture of the lips, representing, as Mr Bell believes, a corresponding contraction of the guttural passage (the real cause of the change of sound) and probably also of the upper part of the larynx. If we "round" the vowel in "eel," for example, we get the German *ü*, "high-front-round," according to Mr Bell's arrangement, "in which the labial orifice is reduced to little more than a chink;" while the broad aperture of (ah), which is a "low-back-wide," is "rounded" to (o) in "on," "odd," &c. ("low-back-wide-round"), "by contracting only the corners of the lips¹."

Out of these thirty-six sounds, twenty-two occur in English. But six of these, the open mixed-sounds, differ from each other very slightly. They are the sounds heard in "places" (High), "fatal" (Mid), "err" (Low), "pleasure" (High Round), "oratory" (Mid R.), "orator" (Low R.). It will be observed that five of these sounds occur in unaccented syllables: and that they all represent variations of what is commonly called the "neutral vowel," that sound to which the vowels of all unaccented syllables have a tendency to return, and which is also supposed to be heard in "but," "son," "fir," and to be sufficiently denoted by a single symbol, as by the *e* of Prof. Lepsius. At all events, Mr Bell's distinctions will not be required by us, but the existence of the neutral vowel itself must be borne in mind, as it undoubtedly occurs in every language. It is sometimes called the *Urvocal*—unfortunately, as that may be interpreted to mean that it is the vowel (instead of *ah*) from which other vowels can be traced. Its most typical formation is no doubt that given by Mr Bell for the *a* in *fatal*, where the tongue is in the position of perfect rest, without action of either the back or front part.

We start with the vowel *a* (ah) for two reasons. First, on physiological grounds—it is the vowel par excellence,

¹ *Id.*

CH. IV.

vowels,
modifications of
the first
eighteen.

Number of
English
vowels.

The
"neutral"
vowel.

Reasons
for com-
mencing
with *a*.

CH. IV.

the most open vowel position: the back of the tongue is depressed beneath the soft palate, which however does not seem to be raised¹: the lips are in the most open position, not "rounded." The second reason is found in the history of the vowels: we find, as a matter of experience, that when there has been a change between *a* and *i*, or *a* and *u*, the change has always been from *a* to *i*, or from *a* to *u*, and not the reverse. Without, then, asserting that there ever was a time when *a* existed, and *i* and *u* did not, we may yet fairly call *a* an older vowel, because in many cases *i* and *u* are demonstrably younger. It has been pointed out by Schleicher that *a* is more distinctly vocal than either *i* or *u*, because while they are closely cognate to *y* and *w*, it always preserves its full vowel character. These three vowels, *a*, *i*, and *u* belonged to the Indo-European language. Let us then make *a* our starting point, and proceed to investigate the relations of the other sounds to it.

Two lines
of vowels
necessary.

If the tongue were the only agent in producing the various positions which give the different vowel-sounds, we should have been able to start from *a*, where the tongue is in the lowest position, and arrange all the vowels in one scale, ending with the highest position, i. e. at *i*, that is (*ee*). But this is not so. It has been already pointed out that each vowel-sound so obtained can be modified by that contraction of the vocal tube which finds its outward expression in the greater roundness of the lip-aperture. This fact necessitates a second line, again commencing with *a* and running as far as *u* (*oo*): this at least is the extremity of the scale in England, but in pronouncing *u* the tongue is still at the back of the palate: if it be put through the same range of positions in this scale as in the other, the limit will be the German *ü*. It can hardly be doubted that these three English sounds, *āh*, *ee*, *oo*, represent the three original vowels *A*, *I*, *U*. No

¹ Max Müller (II. 124) gives the result of Prof. Czermak's experiments, that the soft palate is lowest for *a*, then for *e*, *o*, *u*, *i* in order.

other sounds, so far as I know, have ever permanently usurped their place in any European language except our own.

Now in each of these scales from *a* to *i*, and from *a* to *u*, there is a very great number of possible vowel-positions. I will point out only the most important in each scale. The first variations from *a* are however by no means easy to classify. There is a debateable land, and some sounds lie close on the unknown border-line. Such are the (ǣ) and (ǔ) in "ask" and "up¹." By the (ǣ) of "ask" is meant a middle sound between "ah" and "an," which is constantly heard in conversation, but which has never been definitely assigned by custom to any word; it is nearly always heard in "ask." There is a transition constantly going on in England from the full (ah) which survives now in so few words, to the (ǣ) in "an," which perhaps belongs to no other language but the Sanskrit: and it would be quite possible to mark by a symbol some point in the intervening space, which should represent the (ǣ) of "ask;" but this has never been done. This (ǣ) is an open sound; the corresponding close sound is the (ǔ) of "up:" which certainly, to my ear, seems very like the "neutral" vowel of unaccented syllables. These two sounds, then, I classify in neither scale: but between the first variations of each. First, in the scale from A to I, the "front" vowels, as they may be called, come the short English (ǣ) of "an," which is open, and the (ǝ) of "ell," which is close: for these the back of the tongue is low², (though higher than for any vowel of the "back" class): and the point of the tongue is much depressed. Next to these, but produced by a considerable raising of both the back and front of the tongue, come the Italian open *e* (è) and close *e* (é). We

Dubious vowels.

(i) *The "front" vowels.*

¹ I differ here from Mr Bell, who classes these as "mid-back" sounds, they seem to me "mixed." My arrangement is nearer to that of Prof. Lepsius.

² I do not understand Mr Bell's diagram of the position of the tongue for these two sounds. It seems to me, after repeated experiments, that he has placed the back of the tongue much higher than it really is.

CH. IV.

have no exact equivalent in common English for the open \bar{e} , except in words ending with the glide r , e.g. "pair:" the close e is nearly our long English (\bar{a}) when pronounced, as it almost always is, with a slight i -sound following it, in fact as a diphthong; whether the i be written or not, the pronunciation is the same, e.g. "pail" or "pale¹." The vowel sound in "pail," if pronounced, as it is in some English dialects, e.g. in Cumberland, is more like the open e^2 .

The last pair of sounds in this scale are open (\bar{i}) and close (ee): they are heard in "pill" and "peel" respectively. For these the tongue is almost exactly in the same position as for the consonant y , the back and point being both raised as much as possible, but not of course so near the palate as to produce friction. We have thus marked all the principal points from the extremely open a (ah), to the extremely close i (ee). All of these come into the class of "Front Vowels."

(ii) *The back and rounded vowels.*

Next, let us take the list of "Back" and of "Rounded" vowels: in English they are identical: in French and German we have rounded front-vowels. First, come open (\bar{o}) and close (aw): heard in "Poll" (the bird) and "Paul." Next, come the Italian open \bar{o} and the corresponding close sound, our (\bar{o})³: therefore for classification it will probably be better to take our (\bar{o}) as the typical sound, and to regard the Italian \bar{o} as a deviation from it. If close o be heard in "pole," the open o will be pretty nearly heard in the Cumberland variation of the same word, or in the word "pour," where r follows. For each of these o -sounds


¹ Compare Prof. Munro's *Remarks on the Pronunciation of Latin*, p. 6.

² Mr Roby (*Grammar*, p. 9) makes the Italian open e a "front," that is a primary or close, not an open sound; the class to which, according to Mr Bell, "ell" belongs. Mr Roby himself compares the Scotch sound of "ell," which is certainly much more open. According to his arrangement, Italian open and close e do not fit into my system of the open and close vowels. There is also some discrepancy between us with respect to the open and close o . I am not competent to decide the question, but give my own arrangement as in my view most probable. Mr Bell does not deal with the Italian vowels.

³ The Italian close o seems to be nearer to u , or, as Mr Roby makes it, a "High Mixed Wide (i.e. open) Round."

the tongue is raised at the back from its position for (ö) and (aw); but not so much as for *e* in "pair" and "pale;" and the lip aperture is rounded. If now the mouth be placed in the position for "pail," and then rounded, the modified *o* of Germany (ö) or the French *eu* will be heard. Again, if the tongue be slightly raised from the position for "pole," and the lips very much contracted, we get the final English pair (ü) and (oo) in "pull" (open) and "pool" (close). The position of the tongue for this *u* (oo) bears the same relation to that for the consonant *w*, as that for *i*, mentioned above, bears to that for *y*. Lastly, if the lips be rounded while the tongue is in the position for the front vowel *i*, the result will be the German *ü*, and nearly the French *u*. It will be seen that the modified vowels *ö* and *ü* thus combine the characteristics of the two classes: in their tongue-position they belong to the first; in their rounded character to the second. They may therefore be fairly placed between them in the following "pyramid," the place which they occupy in that of Prof. Lepsius, though he gives no reason for putting them there.

Vowel
pyramid.



The entire arrangement of the sounds is nearly that of Prof. Lepsius: but with the further distinction of open

CH. IV.

and close sounds throughout, and of the round vowels, for which I am indebted to Mr Bell. In each couple of sounds the open vowel is placed *above* the close, so that the lines pass from the most open sound (ah) to the most close (ee), ü, and (oo). The symbols A_e , A_o are employed to denote the sounds between *a* and *e*, and *a* and *o*, which occur at the beginning of these two lines. The marks of quantity above the English symbols must be understood as applying to the English only.

*Terms
"open" and
"close,"
how far
convertible
with long
and short.*

It will be observed that the terms "open," and "close," in the above classification, sometimes are equivalent to "short," and "long." This is always permissible in English, but not always in other languages. Thus in English it is unimportant whether we call the *i* in "sin" short or open, the *ee* in "seen" long or close. In the tone of each man's ordinary speech it is impossible to pronounce "sin" long, without its becoming "seen:" but in singing, it is quite possible to lengthen the *i* without letting it pass into *ee*. It is indeed possible, on the other hand, to pronounce in our natural tone "seen" short, that is, so that the vowel shall occupy no longer time than the *i* of "sin;" which is the only test of quantity. Practically however with us, "seen" is always longer than "sin:" therefore, as I said, the terms "open," and "short," are convertible in English; and also "long," and "close." The same may be said of *u*, open and close. But it must not be supposed that this convertibility is universal. In modern Italian, and in modern Greek, the short *i* is not the vowel sound of "sin," but really the short of "seen," that is, a short close vowel. Therefore we have four variations of *i*; short open, the English ĩ ; long open, in singing; short close, the Italian ĩ ; long close, the Italian ĩ̄ , and English zē , which are the same. We need not doubt that the Graeco-Italian long ĩ̄ also was the last sound: but what was the Graeco-Italian ĩ ? The only evidence that can be adduced, is the modern pronunciation of each language; in which there is no appearance of any variation.

Such arguments do not commonly carry much weight. When we find so much change taking place in the vocalism of a language in a few hundred years, how much greater changes may reasonably be expected to have occurred between the first centuries of the Christian era and our time? Constant change is the normal state of language: and absolute agreement of ancient and modern sounds is almost a suspicious circumstance. Yet here we may perhaps give more weight than usual to the evidence, for this reason: close *i* is the very thinnest sound in language: the resonance-cavity behind the organs which produce it is the smallest possible for any vowel¹. If therefore a vowel had once sunk to this sound, there was no further for it to go: it is therefore possible that the close *i* may have been reached even before our era, and so, except by some reversion of the natural order of phonetic change, it must have remained unchanged ever since: and it is in accordance with the early weakness of the Latin system that the vowel should soon sink as far as possible. The analogy however of the Italian *e* and *o* tends in the opposite direction. In Italian, open *e* and *o* represent short Latin *e* and *o*, with tolerable regularity: and close *e* and *o* represent Latin *ē* and *ō*. It seems to me therefore not possible to speak with certainty on the sound of Graeco-Italian *ī* and *ū*: but the sounds of *ī* and *ū* are fairly certain.

The results of this description of the vowels, so far as they shew us the changes which we may *à priori* expect to find in any given language, may be very briefly stated. We cannot expect to find nearly so much accordance as we found in the general principles of consonantal change. The tendencies of phonetic and dynamic change (or of

General
rules of
vowel
strength.

¹ It will be remembered that there is no difference between an open and a close vowel as far as the position of the tongue or lips is concerned; but the soft palate is lower for the close than for the open sound, and therefore the hollow of the mouth behind the tongue in which the air sounds—commonly called the *resonance-cavity*—is diminished for the close sounds.

CH. IV.

*Regular
passage
from A
down each
line.*

change, originally phonetic, but dynamically applied) cross each other: the creative power of language is still manifested in the vowels, long after anything but decay can be looked for in the consonants. It is therefore not possible to lay down even a general scale of vowel strength: the scale of the Graeco-Italian is very different from that of the Teutonic languages, and there are considerable differences between the Greek and Italian. All languages agree in deriving other sounds from the full *a* sound: but the order of the derivatives greatly varies. It is clear that *a* is the most likely vowel to be corrupted. The check is applied to the voice, at the earliest point, after leaving the larynx. For other vowels, the check is applied at different points along the palate. Now, as the current of air loses more of its strength the farther it goes, we should expect the sounds to become weaker along the different lines to *i* and *u*. In other words, *ǣ* would naturally pass into *ě*, and then into *ĩ*: and the long vowels would be found in the same order, though with more probability of variation, from the very time required to produce them. If the sounds between *a* and *u* were simple sounds like those from *a* to *i*, the same rule would be expected to hold; *a* would become *o*, and *o* become *u*. But these are complex sounds; the lips, as well as the tongue, are concerned in their production: the small saving of muscular effort for *u*, at the back of the mouth, may be neutralised by the greater action of the lips, and therefore it is uncertain whether *o* should pass into *u*, or *u* into *o*: it will depend upon each nation, which portion of the vocal organs shall be more exerted. But what we may call the natural scale of strength—that which is followed in the above account—was preserved by the Graeco-Italian race, very exactly by the Greeks, less perfectly by the Italians. In the Teutonic languages, the tendency is on the whole rather to change *i* to *e*, and *u* to *o*. These changes may be due to the fact, that the Northern nations allowed *a* to sink at once to *i* and *u*, instead of *e* and *o*,

like the Southern: when the necessity for distinctions of sound arose, they would be compelled to move backwards on each line. This is in harmony with the known changes of their consonantal system. For us, however, in our consideration of Greek and Latin etymologies, the natural scale is of importance.

Few useful rules can be laid down to regulate the passage of a sound, from one line into the other line. For this we must depend on the observed facts of each language. Those languages, in which the vowel system is strongest, avoid such changes: they are exceedingly rare in Greek: in Latin, where the vocalism was weak, they are frequent. The change from *u* to *i* is decidedly the most common in all languages, and is in accordance with the nature of the sounds, the first being complex and also partly produced farther back in the mouth. The change from *e* to *u* is rare. I know no language in which *i* passes into *u*.

*No useful
rules for
passage
from one
line to
another.*

CHAPTER V.

THE INDO-EUROPEAN ALPHABET.

CH. V.

The Indo-European Alphabet exhibited in roots and words.

I NOW proceed to give examples of Indo-European roots and words, which have been deduced from the various forms in which they are found in the different languages according to their special phonetic laws. These words will prove the existence of the consonants already attributed to this language: and will convey a firmer impression of the actual existence of such a speech than a mere enumeration of letters or roots could do. It will be seen at once that in some languages (especially in the Sanskrit) some of the consonants have been so much corrupted that the identification of e.g. a common Greek and Sanskrit root, may not be obvious without some knowledge of the phonetic laws of Sanskrit, which would account for the variation. This difficulty is unavoidable and cannot be met here, because it does not come under my plan to give in detail the phonetic laws of any language except of the Greek and of the Latin. The different changes of the Teutonic languages will be shewn by the variations of the words given: a full account of Grimm's Law is given in the second series of Max Müller's lectures, and in Ferrar's *Comparative Grammar*: but for the sake of those who have not got those works, a simple list of the changes is given at the end of the chapter. The Gothic forms are valuable to us because Gothic is a Low German dialect, like our own: and the same consonants are commonly found in each. Several Anglo-Saxon forms have been given in order to facilitate the

comparison of English words¹. It must be remembered that the modern High German sometimes varies much from the older form. Lithuanian has been taken as the most important (for comparison) of the great Slavonic branch of the North European family: but sometimes Slavonic forms are given instead. I shall give the *regular* substitutes for each letter in each of these languages. The irregular merely sporadic variations of the Greek and Latin will come under our notice afterwards: those of the other nations do not concern us. I begin with the momentary sounds, and among them with the hard sounds².

I. Momentary sounds:
1. Hard sounds.

K.

(Ind.-Eur. *K* = Sk. *k*, *kh*, *ch*, *ç* = Gk. *κ* = Lat. *c*, *qu*. = Goth. *hv*, *h*, *g* = O. H. G. *h*, *g* = Lith. *k*, *sz*. = Slav. *k*, *s*.)

Thus the Ind.-Eur. root *AK*, expressing "sharpness," must be assumed as the root-form of the Greek *ἀκ-οντ*, *ἀκ-ωκ-ή* and *ἄκρος*, of the Lat. *ac-us*, *acu-o* and *ac-ies*; the natural transition to the idea of quickness is found in Sk. *āç-u*, Gk. *ᾠκ-u*, Lat. *ōci-us*. The root has been prolific in all the branches of the family: but in the North European there is some difficulty in distinguishing its derivatives from those of *AGH*. But we may attribute to it the A.-S. *egg-ian*, to incite, "egg" on: and *cher*, afterwards *éar*, our "ear" of corn: perhaps also *eglian*, to feel ill, or "ail." Prof. Curtius³ seems to be right in combining the O. H. G. *hamar*—our "hammer"—with the Lith. *ak-men*, and the Sk. *aç-man*; each of which means a stone, and the latter

¹ For these I am indebted to the Rev. W. W. Skeat, the well-known editor of *Piers the Plowman*, &c.

² Most of the following examples are taken from the second part of Curtius' *Griechische Etymologie*, from Fick's *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen*, and from his later book, *Die Ehemalige Spracheinheit der Indo-Germanen Europas*. It is needless to add that numbers more may be found where these were taken from. The object of the present selection is to direct the curious to these interesting collections.

³ *Gr. Et.* No. 3.

also a thunderbolt; and with the strange Greek ἄκ-μων, which commonly means an anvil, but in Hesiod¹, the χάλκεος ἄκμων οὐρανόθεν κατίων can mean nothing but the thunderbolt. If all these words, as is probable, though Prof. Curtius with characteristic caution declines to affirm it, are to be referred to the root AK, we see in the "hammer" and the "anvil" the development of the further idea of "hardness," whilst the earlier idea of "swiftness," hard entirely to be dislodged, lingered in Greek if but in the thunderbolt of Hesiod.

Very dissimilar in meaning is KI, the root of "quietness;" the ground-form of Sk. \sqrt{ci} to lie and of \sqrt{ki} in Greek; this simplest form does not occur in any word, but the first step in vowel-intensification is to be seen in κείμαι—not therefore a perfect in form any more than in sense, but a present form intensified in a rare though perfectly natural manner—in κοίτη a bed, and probably in Κύμη², in which case the *υ* would be a weakening of the radical vowel *ι*, more frequently found in Aeolic than in the other dialects; and if this derivation be true, it will be difficult to exclude κόμη and κῶμος from the same family. The certain Latin form is \sqrt{qui} whence *quies*—but Prof. Curtius would derive also *civis* from the simpler root-form \sqrt{ci} . *Civitas* did not necessarily imply to a Roman residence in any one large town: and the antiquity of the use of this root to denote settled abodes—but not so much towns as villages—is shewn further by the Gothic *haims*; thus we find "haimos jah baurghs" used in Mark i. 38 to answer to the Greek κομπούλεις—the German *heim*, our *home* and *hām* as a termination: and in Lithuanian also *kēma-s* is a village. It would of course be an entire mistake to conclude that "home" and its cognate words in the northern languages ever meant the "quiet peaceful place," natural as the association may seem. Only the Latin race seems to have developed the secondary meaning "rest," "peace," from a root which, like all others,

¹ Theog. 722.² Gr. Et. 134.

had originally only a physical force—"to lie," and our "home" is (etymologically) nothing but the place where our forefathers settled or "laid them down." This obvious and important rule, that the derivatives of one language must be kept clear of the associations which cling to the derivatives of another—unless there is good evidence to shew that the derived idea was developed before the separation of the two peoples—is not always observed even by eminent philologists.

There is another root *KI*, exactly the same in form, with precisely the opposite meaning. From it come *κινέω* and *κί-νν-μαι*; in Latin *cio* and *cio*, *citus*, originally a participle, and *solli-citus*, "in entire motion." The simple root is seen in Homeric Greek, in the imperfect *κί-ον*. Neither of these two roots can be traced back to any simpler form, nor can any common original meaning be assigned to them from which the two meanings, to be quiet, and to move, can be plausibly derived. This fact may shew the need of caution in speculating on the earliest meaning of roots.

To pass from roots to words whose simple sense and similar form allow us to claim for them a common representative in Indo-European days, we find *k* in *kara*, the "head." This form is certain from the Zend *çara*—though the Sanskrit has allowed the *a* to pass into *i*, and kept only a secondary form, *çiras*—the Greek *κάρα* and the Latin *cere-brum*, the "brain." Ennius' well-known separation of this word into its two parts "head-bearing" (or perhaps "born") may, I think, shew that some sense survived even in his day of the first part having once signified the head, if we take into account the frequency of its occurrence in other (less obvious) compounds, as *crista* (= *cere-sta*) *ceruix* (from *√veh* to carry): in Sanskrit *ciro-dhará* (i.e. *çiras* and the root *dhar*) exactly corresponds to *cer-vec*: compare also *çiro-ruh*, the hair (from *√ruh* to grow): these undoubted compounds are strong evidence for a similar origin of the Latin words. Such

timeses were not likely to be used by old writers, unless the feeling of the word being a compound was vivid; compare *ordia prima* and *facit are* in Lucretius¹. The second part of a compound or a derivative suffix attached to the original noun signifying "head" is the *n* in the Gothic *hvair-nei*, the German *Hirn* and *Gehirn*, and the Lowland Scotch *harns*, Old English "hernes," all meaning brains.

Sum lay stareand on the sternes (stars)
And sum lay, knoked out their hernes².

The same suffix *n* gives our "horn," Gothic *hauru*, Latin *cornu*, all with the same vowel change. *Karna* however in Sanskrit is an ear: and the Greeks formed *κερα-τ* by a different suffix, perhaps originally *Far*, as the *a* appears to have been originally long. This variation illustrates well the indefinite meaning of the suffixes: each new formation meant, apparently, "something on the head." So *cervus* is "that which has something on its head," as the Greek *κέραος*, which was not used as a noun.

The "heart," also in Indo-European, in the form *kard*, kept nearest by Latin *cord*. It occurs in every Teutonic speech, with due modifications. *Καρδ-ία* is a secondary base. The Sanskrit *hṛid*, where both the *k* is weakened to *h* and the *r* to *ṛi*, may lead us to suspect that the earliest form was *skard*, which is itself a root meaning to leap; whence come the German *scherzen*, and perhaps *κόρδαξ* (i.e. *σκορδ-ακ*)³.

A crab was apparently *karka*: this form occurs in no language, but is implied in at least three; in the Sanskrit *karka-ta*, in *κάρκ-ινο*, and in Scl. *rakŭ*, i.e. *krakŭ*. Hesychius gives *κάρχαι* = *καρκίνοι* as Sicilian. The labial in our northern languages shews either a different suffix or dissimilation: we do not find labialisation in the North. "Crab" and "cancer" shew the wide modifications of sense, as well as of form, which the same word may take in

¹ IV. 28, VI. 962.

² Laurence Minot, in Morris's *Specimens*, p. 187, ll. 67, 68.

³ Fick, 37 and 207.

coming to us by different roads. "Crayfish" has been already mentioned.

Ka denoted "who" in Indo-Eur., and was retained unaltered in Sanskrit and Lithuanian: it was changed, probably through the same indistinct pronunciation, in Gothic into *hwa* and Latin into *quo*: the Ionic alone in Hellas retained the primary form in *κοῦ*, *κοῖος* (= *ko-yo-s*), while the other dialects substituted *π* for *κ*. In Scotch we find *qu-hare* (=where): this return to something like the old form is curious; but the *qu* represents only a stronger breath than *w*, not a shut sound; and is probably to be explained as a result of the strong Keltic tendency to gutturals, shewn in the pronunciation of English words by a people which doubtless contains a strong Keltic element.

Lastly, *katvar* must have been the primitive form from which through many changes, some of which will come before our notice later on, came the Sk. *chatvāras*, the Gk. *τετράρες* (a form which does not occur, but is necessary to explain the dialectical variants *τέσσαρες* and *τέρορες*), the Lat. *quattuor*, Gothic *fidvor*, and Lith. *keturi*. It will be observed in both the last examples that a majority of the derived languages exhibit a labial sound, which either occurs after the guttural (as *v* or *w*) or has altogether driven it out of the field, remaining itself as *p* or *f*: and the *ch* in *chatvāras* must have been produced by some consonant following after the original *k*.

The extensive labialisation of *k* in the derived languages led Leo Meyer some time since to suspect that there was a double *k* in Indo-European—one pure, and one with a slight *w*-sound following it. The question has been more thoroughly examined by Fick¹, who has arrived at a curious, but seemingly certain result. He shews that in one set of words we find *k* (*kh*, *ch*) in Sanskrit, *κ* or *π* in Greek, *c* or *qu* in Latin, *k* in Lithuanian and Slavonic: in another set we find *ç* in Sanskrit,

¹ *Einheit*, &c., pp. 3—34.

sz (i.e. *sh*) in Lithuanian, *s* in Slavonic, but *κ* in Greek and *c* in Latin without any instance of labialisation: the apparent exception—ἵππος, *equos*, Sk. *açva*—rather proves the rule, because here the *w*-sound belongs to a distinct syllable, and is not a variation of the *k*. In one or two cases *k* does seem to occur in Lithuanian where we have *ç* in Sanskrit; *akmen*, Sk. *açman*, mentioned above is one: here the *ç* may be a later Sanskrit change: the same may be true of Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{çi}}$, Lith. *kēmas*, Latin *quies*¹. Still his facts seem to me sufficient to prove the existence of a double *k*-sound in Indo-European: one *k* followed by an imperfect *w*-sound: one with a tendency to be sibilated. The only alternative to this conclusion is the supposition that the Letto-Slavic branch came in some way into contact with the Asiatic peoples after their original separation; and that their striking harmony in sibilating the *k* arose from this association: which supposition is eminently improbable.

T.

(Indo-Eur. *T* = Sk. *t*, *th* = Gr. *τ* = Lat. *t* = Goth. *th*, *d* = O. H. G. *d* = Lith. *t*.)

A very important root is *TA*, strengthened probably in very early times to *TAN*: the stronger form is found in all the branches of the family. Thus we have in Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{tan}}$ "to stretch," though the past participle *ta-ta-s* is to be referred to the older and simpler form. The Greek has $\sqrt{\text{τα}}$, $\sqrt{\text{ταν}}$, and $\sqrt{\text{τεν}}$ preserved in *τά-σις*, *τέ-ταν-ος* and *τέν-ων* respectively. So also in Homer we find an imperative *τῆ*², in the sense of holding, found likewise in *teneo*. The simple idea has been very generally retained: *τεῖνω* and *tendo*, the Goth. *thanja* and Lith. *tempju*, all mean "I stretch out," or "extend." Various secondary significations are found—in *τάναος*; in *tenuis*, *tener*, *tenax*; in German

¹ Fick says nothing of this discrepancy, but connects *quies*, &c. with $\sqrt{\text{ski}}$ = $\sqrt{\text{κτι}}$ wrongly, in my opinion.

² E. g. *Od.* v. 346.

dünn and our "thin." The transfer to sound as something extended appears to be certain in *τόνος*, "tone" (Curtius compares the phrase *τείνειν βόην*, &c.), and Sanskrit *tāna* (where the *ā*, as often, agrees with Greek *ο*). But I am not so sure that *tonitru*, O. H. G. *doner* and our "thunder" should be referred to this root¹. The Sanskrit *stanita* (with the same meaning) speaks strongly for a root STAN to sound, whence German *stöhnen*, and the Greek *στένειν*, all implying noise of different kinds².

It is possible that *-tāti*, which is a very common suffix in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin—*deva-tāti*, *νεο-τατι*, *ciui-tati*—may be a noun formed from this root TA by the suffix *ti*: which at first implied "stretching," "extension," and passed at last into the more general sense of "state," "condition." But it is equally possible that *tati* may be an amalgamation of two simple suffixes *ta* and *ti*, though the lengthening of the *a* is hard to account for. On the first hypothesis *ciui-tati* is a *compound*, i.e. a noun produced by the union of two nominal bases, like *usu-fructu*, &c., not a *derivative*, i.e. a root or base with a suffix³.

A verb *tam* occurs in Sanskrit expressing breathlessness, exhaustion. A causal in Slavonic means to press, annoy, &c. But in several languages a noun occurs meaning darkness, obscurity, Sanskrit *tamas*, Lith. *tam-sà*; in Lithuanian also *tīma* is dark, and our "dim" is A. S. *thimm*. It seems highly probable that the Latin *temere* is an old case of this noun, meaning "in the dark:" and *tene-brae* may be *teme-bara*, "darkness-bringing," in which, as Curtius suggests, the following *b* has dissimilated the *m* to *n*. The mysterious rule of prosody in old grammars, "e in temere semper eliditur," may be explained by the discrepancy between its actual length (*temas+é*) and the feeling in the Augustan age, that adverbs of this class

¹ See Max Müller, II. 93. Farrar, *Chapters on Language*, 177. Curtius, *Gr. Et.* No. 230.

² See Benfey, *Sk. Lex.* s.v. *stan*.

³ For a capital account of compound nouns in Latin, see Roby's *Grammar*, I. 378—396.

should have their final *e* short. It would seem that the conception of night in *tamas* is "the disquieting season:" compare *nox* (from NAK, whence νέκυσ, *nox*, *noceo*, &c.), and εὐφρόνη, which is probably as much a euphemism as the Euxine.

An especially large number of secondary roots cluster round the root STA, another very early root in which our consonant T occurs. It is found with singularly little change of form (it has become $\sqrt{sth\acute{a}}$ in Sanskrit where *t* after *s* regularly passes into *th*) and none of meaning in all the derived languages: and the radical sense is also perceptible in nearly all the derivatives: thus στήμων is the "upright" of the loom: *sta-bulum*, the place where cattle stand, &c. But there are numerous derivatives, less obviously connected with the idea of standing, from the secondary roots,—all Indo-European—STAL, STAV, STAMBH, &c.—STAL is affirmed by the Gk. στέλεχος, our "stalk," the German *stiel*, our "stall," and provincial "stele," the handle of a pitchfork; in στέλλω the sense is apparently causal, and *prae-stol-or* is "I place myself in front of another;" the etymological sense however being so far lost that in the earliest times we know the verb is found with an accusative: and it was probably a revival of the feeling of the derivation that connects it with a dative in the writings of Cicero. From STAV¹ we have σταῦρος, and *stiva*: the Homeric στεῦμαι seems to connect itself with this root more naturally than with any other; as in *Il. III. 83*, where Hector στεῦται τι ἔπος ἐρέειν, "is steadfast to speak;"—the meaning found in Sk. *sthāvara* and the Gothic *stiviti*, "endurance." The derivatives of STAMBH are not easy to distinguish from those of a simpler form STAP, which has furnished Sanskrit with the causal of STA and is the base of the Latin *stipare*, of the German *Stift*, and of our "stub;" but the stronger form is seen in Sk. *stambha* a "post," Gk. στέμφυλον, pressed olives or grapes, and German *stampf* and *stampfen*², our "stump"

¹ Curtius, *Gr. Et.* No. 217.

² *Gr. Et.* No. 219.

and "stamp." The primary meaning of STAP would seem to have been to "cause to stand," or "support:" that of STAMBH to "press"—but the close resemblance of the two forms as well as of their meanings has caused confusion in several of the derivatives, e.g. ἀστεμφής. The cognate words στίβος, στείβω, στιβάς, στιβαρός "stout" (in the sense of being close pressed), στοιβή "stuffing," agree in sense very well with STAMBH, but do not agree exactly in form with either root. I should classify them under a secondary STIB, formed through a weakened STI: compare TRIB from TAR¹. With them may go our "step." The Latin *stupor* and *stupere* might very well be connected with STAP, as expressing that which causes a man to stand. The rare Homeric words τάφος, wonderment, and the participle ταφών, amazed, are often referred to the same root², in connection with *stupor*. In this case we should have to suppose that the initial *s* changed τ into θ—*sthap*—and then fell off, leaving θαπ, which occurs in τέθηπ-α, and by the ordinary Greek change could become ταφ when required. But the Greeks had no dislike to the combination στ; witness the numerous words where it is initial: and therefore I think it more likely that θαπ was a secondary root from √θα; and that it is found nasalised in θάμβος.

The very remarkable root TAK is admirably described by Prof. Curtius³: it has varied in some derived languages into √tek and √tok: and it has also a by-form TUK, occurring both in Sanskrit and Greek, and another by-form √tik, found however only in Lithuanian; and yet three apparently distinct significations, to "beget" (e.g. τεκεῖν), to "hit" (τόξον, τυχεῖν), and to "construct" (τέκτων, τύκος), are found in the first two languages indifferently expressed by the three forms, and in Lithuanian all by modifications of √tik. I should be disposed to think that

¹ p. 46.

² As by Fick, 210.

³ Gr. Et. No. 235.

the main forms, *tak*, *tik*, *tuk*, are all Indo-European, and probably each at first had its own meaning; but that the formation of several derivatives, very similar to each other in sense, from the different roots, led to confusion between those roots in the very earliest times. If the variation of the form was at first phonetic, it anticipated the German "ablaut."

P.

(Ind.-Eur. *P.*=Sk. *p*, *ph*=Gr. π =Lat. *p*=Goth. *f*, *p*=O. H. G. *f*, *v*, *b* [the latter in the middle of a word]=Lith. *p*.)

A root which has played a large part at least in the Greek and Latin languages is PAR. It is Indo-European, for it occurs, though not often in Sanskrit, in the sense of "bringing over," only Vedic¹: also in the Gothic *farjan*, with the same sense, the German *Fahrt* and other words, and our "wayfarer." But it is in the Greek and Latin that this root has been most fertile, and produced the largest variety of meanings. The sense of Sk. *pīparmi*, and Gothic *farjan*, is found in $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, so common in Homer², for "carrying over sea for sale," and this connecting link justifies us in connecting with this root $\pi\iota\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\mu\pi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, and others. We find however $\sqrt{p\alpha\eta}$ (i.e. *par-n*= $\pi\acute{\epsilon}p\text{-}\nu\eta\text{-}\mu\iota$) in Sanskrit with the same sense, where the sea does not help us: the primary idea of a sale may have been no more than a passing over from hand to hand. The simple idea of "crossing" is found in $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$ used as a neuter verb, $\pi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\rho\theta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, &c., and our "ferry;" *portus* and *porta* are also purely local: $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha$ (for $\pi\epsilon\rho\text{-}\gamma\alpha$) and *periculum* mark the transition to the world of abstract conception, and $\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and *peritus* are applied to the man who has "gone through" many things.

This PAR must be kept distinct from another root, identical in form, but quite dissimilar in meaning, to "fill."

¹ Benfey, *Sk. Dict.* s. v.

² E.g. *Od.* xv. 453.

From this come *πίμπλημι*, *πλήθος*, the Latin *plenus*, probably *plebs* (secondary); Sanskrit *pura* a city and *πόλις*. These last two, however, are formed by different suffixes: the Indo-Europeans seem to have had no word for a city: and this first conception of "a full place," among the Hindus and Greeks, does not imply strength, or fortification. No such "strong place" is to be assumed from Gothic. "baurg," our "burg," and *πύργος*: the two do not correspond; *baurg* is equivalent to the Greek *φραγμός*¹: *πύργος*, which is isolated in Greek, is perhaps a borrowed word; compare the Trojan Pergama. PAR, in the sense of "putting forth," "giving," in *pario*, perhaps *parentes*², *pars*, *ἔπορον*, &c., may be a secondary application to this root, or may be a distinct third form.

There is a root SPAR, expressing quick jerking motion, which appears in a very curious number of different forms in Greek and Latin, due to the difficulty of the original combination of sounds. *Sp* seems to have been felt a more difficult compound than *st*; these two sounds are produced very near together in the mouth: in fact, the point of the tongue has merely to be slightly raised, after sounding *s*, to produce *t*: there is no other change in the speech organs: but for *p*, the lips must be put into action; *s* and *p* are widely separate. Accordingly *s* was either dropped (as in many languages) from initial *sp*, or aspirated *p* into *ph*, thus diminishing the strength of the *p* contact: but while *sp* remained, this heavy consonantal compound, ending with a labial, had power to change the vowel *a* to the more labial vowel *u*—a process which will be afterwards seen very distinctly in Latin. Lastly, in this root, as in many others ending with *r*, the *r* could pass into *l*, whether before or after the separation of languages is, as we have seen, uncertain. We thus get, beside SPAR, the by-forms, SPHAR, SPUR, SPAL, SPHAL, PAL. This variety of form may seem surprising, and some persons may pre-

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 413.

² = *οἱ πορόντες*, *Gr. Et.* No. 376.

fer to assume separate roots. But there is no change above which is not regular, and supported by many unquestionable analogies: and the primary meaning is very closely kept in the derivatives¹. Nearest to the simple form we have *σπαίρω*, or the common *ἀσπαίρω*, where the prosthetic *a* is another attempt to avoid the difficult initial compound; and *σφαῖρα*, a thing jerked or thrown. In the first of these, the motion is of the whole body: *sperno* (originally physical in sense, as is seen in Plautus' favourite combination, *segrego sperno*, and lingering in Virgil's line² "*comitemne sororem spreuisti moriens?*" more clearly in *aspernor*) and *spurius*, and our "spurn," must be put with German *spur* a track and *sporn* a "spur," and *spurnan* O. H. G. to kick, perhaps also *σφυρόν*: and from this comparison we shall be justified in assuming with Curtius, that motion with the foot must here be understood, while in *σπείρω* we certainly have jerking with the hand: and the causal in Sanskrit signifies drawing a bow. In the by-form SPHAL we seem to have the feet again, e.g. in *σφάλλω*, to trip, and *fallo*, in both of which however the sense is nearly always metaphorical: for the loss of *s*, in the Latin, compare *fides*, by *σφίδη*; *funda*, by *σφενδόνη*; *fungus*, by *σπόγγος*. In Graeco-Italian we have PAL, as well as SPHAL, indeed more commonly; e.g. *πάλλω*, to leap or quiver, of the whole body, like *ἀσπαίρω*, and (causally) to brandish; also *πάλλα* a ball: in Latin we have *pila*, and the old verb *pollere* (*pila ludere*, as Festus explains it). In *πα-σπάλ-η*, or *παιπάλη*, we seem to have SPAL doubled, to express the constant tossing about of winnowed corn: in Latin, *pollen* is only the dust which flies about in the mill; and generally the root in Latin is applied to the refuse, not the part selected: *palea* is chaff; and *pulvis* seems to belong to the same root. Many more words apparently akin might be given here, but it is better to stop at what seems certain. There is much danger to

¹ See *Gr. Et.* No. 389; Corssen i. 526; and *Krit. Beiträge*, 308.

² *Aen.* iv. 678.

the etymologer of being led on by analogy—the meaning following through gradually diverging forms—till at last he is landed in the derivatives of some entirely different root.

An Indo-European preposition *apa*, “off” (also=from), may be pretty confidently assumed as the basis of Sk. *apa*, Gr. *απο*, Lat. *ab* (when the final *b* is weakened from *p*, as in *ob*), Gr. *ἐπι* (Sk. *api*), Goth. *af*, German *ab* (in which changes Grimm’s law is justified), the Scotch *aff* and our “of,” now written “off,” for the sake of distinctness. It is also preserved frequently in our initial *a*: “ago” is A. S. *af-gán*: “adown” is *of-dune* (from a hill): though *a* sometimes represents *on* as well, e.g. “aloft” is “on the lyfte” (air), “asleep” is “on sleep.” In most other prepositions there is so much variety both in sound and sense in the different languages that identification is very difficult and uncertain; as indeed was to be expected from the wear and tear by constant use of such small words. But this seems to me one of the strongest reasons for rejecting the ingenious theory of Pott—at least in the wide application which he gives it,—that numberless roots and words are formed out of primary roots preceded by a mutilated preposition in composition with it. Relying on the unquestionable fact that such mutilation is found extensively in Sanskrit words and even roots—thus, for example, it can hardly be doubted that \sqrt{dhyai} “to think” is from *adhi+i* “to go over” on the analogy of *adhi-gam* “to go over” or “read,” and that \sqrt{tyaj} “to leave” is from *ati+aj*, to “cast over” or “away,”—relying also on the fact that this principle of corruption has undoubtedly operated in modern languages: thus e.g. “bishop” has been cut down from *ἐπίσκοπος*; and “pistola” is the modern Italian for *epistola*; on this evidence he throws this process back to Indo-European times. The lawfulness of this method has been strongly denied by Prof. Curtius¹,—principally on the grounds that such analytical formations of words are

(Pott’s theory of secondary roots—formed from primary roots by a preposition which was afterwards mutilated.)

¹ *Gr. Et.* 32.

foreign to the character of an early people: and that as a matter of fact the connection between a prefix and verb in the oldest time was not so intimate as to combine them together into one word, the slightness of the connection being felt even after the separation of languages, as is proved by the agreement of the Greek and Sanskrit in placing the augment and the reduplicated syllable *between* the prefix and the verbal base. To these and other arguments Pott replies¹ with great animation, and I think with some success. But his method is more open to objection when he applies it to the derivation of isolated Greek and Latin words, where there are no cognate derivatives from the suffixed root; and where the preposition itself is somewhat dubious. We may grant the great probability and wonder at the ingenuity of such derivations as *πιέζω* from *ἐπι+εζω* "I sit upon"²; of *φιδίτιον* the Spartan word for the common meal from *φιδίτης* i.e. *assessor*, from *ἐφίζω* for *ἐπι-ίζομαι*³; and admit even the possibility that *πίθος*, a "wine-jar," may be from *ἐπι* and *√θε*, "to set upon;" because in all these and many other cases our analysis leads us to a preposition which we know to be a Greek preposition, and to roots which are Greek roots. But the case is very different when Prof. Pott derives, for example, the Latin *piscis*⁴ from the Indo-European preposition *api* which is the Greek *ἐπί*, and a root *chhad*, which is purely a Sanskrit weakening of original *SKAD*, whence comes the Gothic *skadus*, Germ. *schatten*, or "shadow." *SKAD* meant to cover, and *piscis* is supposed by Prof. Pott to be the "over-covered" with scales, the *squamigerum* genus of Lucretius. This, of course, is possible; but the derivation lacks every element of certainty. The preposition *api* is generally supposed to appear as *ob* in Latin: but this is very doubtful; and in any case the form *ob* would not suit the present derivation: and the existence of *skad* in Latin can scarcely be assumed as certain from a pos-

¹ *Et. Forsch.* II. 320 et seqq.³ *Ib.* I. 572.² *Ib.* I. 514.⁴ *Ib.* I. 515.

sible derivative *castrum* for *skad-trum*: while a simpler form *SKI*, which would certainly be much more suitable for our need, and which does appear in the Greek *σκιά*, does not seem to have any representative whatever in Latin. We must then deem this derivation, together with many others of this most ingenious etymologist, to be "not proven."

G.

Ind.-Eur. *G* = Sk. *g*, *j* = Gr. *γ* = Lat. *g* = Goth. *k* = O. H. G. *k*, *ch* = Lith. *g*, *z*.

2. Soft
momentary
sounds.

Turning now from the hard to the soft consonants we find that *G* occurs in some of the most important roots of the common speech. Examples are hardly needed to shew the extent to which the roots *GA* and *GAN* to "produce" have spread their branches through every language of the family. In all of these the radical meaning is plainly discernible. But it is remarkable that not only *GAN* but also the closely connected form *GNA* to "know" can also be traced through all the derived languages, and there can be no doubt that the Indo-Europeans had definitely separated the two roots to denote one the physical, the other the mental operation. *GNA* appears as *√jnd* in Sanskrit, *√γνω* in Greek, and *√gnā* (*gnarus*), *√gno* (*gnosco*) in Latin; in all these we see the long vowel, which however may be only accidental similarity: the Slav. *znati*, the O. H. G. *knaui* and our "know," agree in keeping the vowel after the compound consonant: in A. S. also *cennan* is to beget, and *cneōwan* is to know; so also our "know:" but in early English we get "knowe" in the ordinary sense, and "kenne" to make to know, or teach: and "ken" is the regular form for knowing in Scotland; and the Gothic *kunnan* and modern German *kennen* shew that the difficulty of the sound led to transposition of the vowel; while it commonly caused the loss of the first consonant in Latin, as in *nomen*, *narrare* = *gnari-gare*, &c.

(except in compounds, as *i-gnobilis*), and among the Greeks it produced a prosthetic vowel, as in *ὄνομα* for *ὄ-γνο-μα*¹: *ὄνομα* is a compensatory lengthening.

¹ Not *γονομα*, as Prof. Key thinks we are driven to assume, in his attack on the "prosthetic vowel" (*Philological Soc. Trans.* 1862-3, p. 155). Granting the occurrence of the older and simpler form *gen* in the instances given in the text, and even the Erse *gen* (to which Prof. Key has courteously referred me), I still think that these older forms used in the later and derived sense are best accounted for by the hypothesis that the difficulty of the new sound caused a return to the older one. It would seem moreover that even in Old Irish *gné* is "reason," and *itargnuim* is "I am wise" (*Celtic Studies*, p. 110): here then we find the later form. Now if *gen* had been the original form for "knowing" in Erse, it is not conceivable that the more difficult form *gna* should have been afterwards adopted.

In the article above referred to, prosthesis is dwelt upon as one of the enormities of the "German School of Linguistic Science." No doubt the principle may be applied too often; but surely Prof. Key himself would not deny the existence of such euphonic vowels, which will be discussed in a later chapter. His derivation however of *ὄφρος* from *ὀφρυ* = "eye-brow" on the analogy of *ὀφ-θαλμός*, instead of regarding the *o* as prosthetic, is ingenious and certainly possible.

Prof. Key's Essay contains much that every philologist must sympathise with, who does not believe Sanskrit to be the one guide to philology, and Sanskrit forms to be the ultimate forms. In this I quite agree with Prof. Key. Thus he justly ridicules the enormous list of roots found in Bopp's Sanskrit Lexicon, to each of which is assigned by Indian grammarians the idea of "going." But no sound philologist would now take one of these mysterious roots and apply it at random to the derivation of some isolated word in another language which may contain no other trace of the root in question. These roots are at best only Indian, and it is quite possible that further investigation of the Sanskrit may lead to differentiation of the meaning of such of these roots as are real roots, and not the invention of Indian grammarians, just as in Greek we can distinguish shades of difference between the roots $\sqrt{\epsilon}$, $\sqrt{\beta\alpha}$, $\sqrt{\epsilon\pi}$, &c., all of which have the general signification of going, but, originally at least, of going in a particular way. No doubt in Bopp's Sanskrit Lexicon there is no discrimination between these roots; and Bopp and his immediate followers may have employed them unwisely in etymology. Further, no doubt many of Bopp's speculations as to the origin of suffixes are pure speculations, and though perhaps as probable as any other, yet essentially incapable of verification. But why does Prof. Key consider all the labours of the "German School" to be summed up in the hypotheses of Bopp? Apparently because Max Müller has said that Bopp's Comparative Grammar "will form for ever the safe and solid basis of Comparative Philology." This may be the slightly exaggerated expression of reverence for the Newton of linguistic science—though it is certainly true of the grand principle of affinity of languages which Bopp was the first definitely to establish. But certainly Prof. Max Müller does not ignore the modifications, extensions and corrections of Bopp's theories which have been effected by the labours of men like Benfey, Curtius, Corssen, Schleicher, and hosts of other German scholars. And to regard Bopp as the final authority of the "German School" on all questions of language seems to me much the same as it would be, in a review of the

From GAN come two nouns *gand* and *gāni*, which have been kept in the main very distinct in the derived languages with a perceptible difference of meaning. Thus from *gand* we have γυνή and Gothic *quinô*, A. S. *quēnd* and our "quean," all terms for a woman, and not on the whole respectful terms: γυνή perhaps is an exception; it is certainly used for a wife in Greek, but was probably more homely and less polite than ἄκοιτις, ἄλοχος, or δάμαρ. Now from *gāni* we get Sk. *jāni* (at the end of compounds) meaning a wife, Gothic *quens* a wife, A. S. *cwen*, also a wife, and our "queen," the wife of the man of men. I do not know to which the Norse *kona* should be assigned; *kone* in Norwegian is a wife. There is no reason for any difference of meaning perceptible in the original forms; each probably meant simply one who can bear children. But words are like living beings: "some grow to honour, some to shame."

The antiquity of the names for the parts of the body is not surprising: we have seen "heart," and "head," already. So *ganu* is evidenced by Sk. *jānu*, γόνυ and *genu*, Goth. *knīu*, Germ. *knīe*, and our "knee."

In Sanskrit *go* is a "cow," which by labialism has become βούς, and *bos*, A. S. *kô*, and German *kuh* (from an older form *chuo*). In Sanskrit *go* is also the earth: and corresponding to this we have γῆ in Greek: the Gothic *gavi*, a province or district, and the German *gau*, as in Rheingau, our *-gay* in Hilgay, Gamlingay, &c., cannot be brought in with any certainty, because Grimm's law would be twice violated without any assignable cause: these words belong probably to original *ghama*, Greek χαμα, in χαμαί: see under GH. Was the commonest term for the earth, at least in India and Greece, if not universally, only a metaphor, the cow of plenty, as it is actually ex-

discoveries of physical science, to disregard all later investigations, and to regard all scientific questions as bound up with the corpuscular theory of light because Newton believed it. A fuller reply to Prof. Key is given by Prof. Whitney, *Linguistic and Oriental Studies*, c, vii.

plained in India? and such metaphors are sufficiently common there to let us pass this without surprise: but they are foreign to the Greek genius, and do not seem likely to have been Indo-European. If so, we must assume that the resemblance between *go* and $\gamma\eta$ is accidental: which perhaps is safest. The oldest form of $\gamma\eta$ seems to have been $\gamma Fa + ya$: by dropping both spirants $\gamma a - a$, i.e. $\gamma\tilde{a}$ or $\gamma\eta$, is left: if the F be dropped, and y vocalised, we have $\gamma a\tilde{a}$: if F forced out the γ we get $Fa\tilde{a}$ or $a\tilde{a}$: if it was vocalised, and y dropped, we get $\gamma\tilde{u}a$ or $\gamma\tilde{u}\eta$ ¹.

The presence of G in an Indo-European noun *bhaga* is probable from the Gk. $\phi\eta\gamma\acute{o}s$, Lat. *fagus*, German *buche*, our "beech," the Gothic *boka*, a "book," and A. S. *bóc*, at once a book and the beech, the tree which supplied the material. There is no Sanskrit equivalent; therefore the antiquity of the word cannot be called certain. That the word has different meanings—in Greek the "oak," in Latin and Teutonic the "beech," is well known. The reason has been discussed by Prof. Max Müller in a very interesting appendix to the fifth Lecture of his second series. He ingeniously suggests that "the Teutonic and Italic Aryans witnessed the transition of the oak period into the beech period, of the bronze age into the iron age, and that while the Greeks retained *phēgos* in its original sense, the Teutonic and Italian colonists transferred the name as an appellative to the new forests that were springing up in their new home." The great antiquity thus claimed for the Aryan settlement in Europe of course seems at first (as it seemed to Prof. Max Müller) to condemn this theory: but really we know nothing of the date of the settlement, and cannot therefore disprove the hypothesis on that ground². But though it seems to me far from improbable, yet I think a simpler explanation of the difference is to be found in the supposition that at

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 132.

² See on this Whitney, *Linguistic and Oriental Studies*, p. 256: Fick, *Einheit*, 30 and 844.

the time of the separation of the peoples the common name used by them meant simply "the tree," not necessarily the oak, as assumed by Prof. Max Müller: and that this name was then applied after the separation to the different trees which were either most common, or most useful to them, in their respective countries¹. Analogous is the restriction of meaning of the Indo-European *drus*, our "tree," to the oak in Greece—though both in the Eastern and the North-Western families the word always kept its general sense. This gradual restriction of a general term to a particular meaning is one of the most interesting tendencies in language, modern as well as ancient: examples are plentiful in English, e.g. *undertaker*, *artist*, &c. are now restricted to one particular calling. So in Greek we have ποιητής: and a "maker" was a poet in Old English also. In Attic ὄρνις was almost confined to the poultry-yard; while a "bird" with us suggests a partridge. A grocer (O. E. grosser) was a man who sold by the gross.

D.

(Indo-Eur. *D*=Sk. *d*, *dh*=Gr. *δ*=Lat. *d*=Goth. *t*=O. H. G. *z*, *sz*=Lith. *d*.)

One of the most obvious roots in which this letter occurs is DA, "to give," though hardly any language but the Latin has retained the vowel unmodified. Thus the Sanskrit form is $\sqrt{dā}$, it being a principle of Sanskrit phonetics that no root shall end in short *a*; probably because the pronunciation of this vowel was so weakened in Sanskrit—it was the neutral vowel, like the *u* in our "sun"—that the root would have been too liable to corruption,

¹ The derivation of the name from the root BHAG contradicts no phonetic laws, and is sufficiently probable; but the connection between a tree and eating is not sufficiently close to warrant us in assuming the derivation as certain: besides, the root probably meant to divide before it meant to eat; which meaning it had in Greek only; so that we cannot argue from this secondary meaning: the Sanskrit \sqrt{bhaksh} is another secondary.

if it had ended with so weak a sound. The Greek form is $\sqrt{\delta o}$, the Latin \sqrt{da} —the \bar{o} in $d\bar{o}(ti)s$, $d\bar{o}num$, &c. may be due to vowel-intensification—the Lithuanian is \sqrt{du} . The Slavonic keeps the short a unchanged: in the Gothic and German the root does not appear. It has not been fertile, in any language, of derivatives which express anything beyond the radical idea.

A more interesting root is DIV^1 , which originally no doubt meant “to be bright,” though no verb with this sense is found in any derived language. In Sanskrit \sqrt{div} means to play—possibly a derived signification, or perhaps the two roots were originally distinct—but the original sense is retained in \sqrt{dyu} , where the v seems to have passed into the cognate vowel, and then i passed into its corresponding semi-vowel, the reason being probably that v could not easily be sounded before suffixes beginning with a consonant: whence e.g. $div-ti$ passed into $dyuti$; compare $\iota\pi\rho\phi\alpha\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$ from root ϕaF^2 . And a Sanskrit \sqrt{div} , in the sense of brightness, is abundantly evidenced by the numerous Sanskrit words for “sky” and “day” derived from it,— $div-a$, $div-asa$, $div-ana$, $dina$ (perhaps shortened from $divana$), &c. The same meaning “day” is found in the Latin $dies$, and compounds such as $nu-dius$, $biduum$ (= $bi-d(i)u-um$); and the Lith. $d\dd{e}va$. The conception of God as “brightness” is universal among the Indo-European peoples. Thus from this root and apparently with the same suffix come the Sk. *Deva*, Greek $\Delta\iota(F)\varsigma$, Latin *Deus*, Lithuanian *D\dd{e}vas* and Norse *Tivorr*, the Icelandic *Týr* and A. S. *Tiw* (whence Tiwesday or Tuesday). As the word means “God,” and that only, in all the languages, it seems more probable that the conception of Deity was primarily that of “the bright one,” than that the word meant first “bright,” then “the sky,” and then, like the Sanskrit *Dyaus* (by one of those mistaken metaphors which, as Prof. Max Müller has shewn, lead to so much mythology), passed finally to the idea of God: indeed

¹ Curt. Gr. Et. p. 213.

² Above, p. 47, note 1.

the distinction between the sky and God is at least as old as the old word for the "sky father," which parted into the Sanskrit *Dyaus-piter* and the Latin *Jup-piter*. Lastly, Prof. Curtius is probably right in attributing to this root the curious Homeric forms δέατο—"he seemed" (*Od.* VI. 242)—and δοάσσατο (*Il.* XIII. 458, &c.), just as δέελος (*Il.* X. 466), δῆλος, with the by-form διάλος (= διF-αλο-ς), mentioned by Hesychius, are certainly from it: all alike have lost the primary sense of appearing brightly or clearly, and retained the general sense of appearing in any way. The affinity of the two verbs was recognised by Buttmann¹; but he refers them to δάω—found in δέδαα and δαῖναι—to "teach" or "learn," which seems much less satisfactory.

The process here assumed, by which a root with a meaning originally *special*, has in certain derivatives lost that narrower sense and retained a perfectly general meaning, is exceedingly interesting. It has been already mentioned²; and one of the most interesting chapters in Curtius' great work³ is that in which he shews that the numerous roots by which the Greeks could denote the general idea of "seeing" (e.g. VID, VOR, SKEP, DRAK, LUK, and many others), meant all primarily to see or look in some very special way; and whilst one set of derivatives from each (including the simple verb) retained only the colourless meaning of seeing, others in each case remained faithful to their original sense. Thus ἰδεῖν, ὁρᾶν, σκοπεῖν, δρακεῖν, λείσσειν, to a Greek all meant simply "to see:" and yet √Fιδ must originally have expressed seeing with some kind of recognition, whence √vid in Sanskrit and οἶδα in Greek and our "to wit" mean "to know:" √Fop "to look with care"⁴ retained its old sense in ὄρα, Latin

(Generalisation of roots.)

¹ *Lexilogus*, p. 212.

² Note to p. 118. The development of Egyptian hieroglyphics presents some curious parallels and on a much more extensive scale. See Lenormant, *Essai sur la propagation de l'Alphabet Phénicien*, p. 16.

³ *Gr. Et.* Book I. § 13.

⁴ In the *Erläuterungen* (p. 152, Eng. trans.), Curtius connects with this radical diversity of meaning the actual employment of some of these

vereor, and our “warden” and “wary:” $\sqrt{\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi}$ “to look out eagerly” is still vivid in $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$: $\sqrt{\delta\rho\alpha\kappa}$ “to look bright” has its full force in $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega\nu$: and a similar sense may have originally belonged to LUK (whence a strengthened stem $\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\kappa$ gives us $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega$ and $\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$), which gave the Latins *lu(c)men*, *lu(c)na*, and us our “light,” Scotch “lowe:” but in Lithuanian the verb is to expect, “look out.”

From the root DIV mentioned above came *devar*, one of the numerous terms denoting relationship by marriage, which can be traced back to Indo-European times. It is unchanged in Sanskrit: it is $\delta\alpha\eta\rho$, and *leuir* in Latin, by a not uncommon change of *d* to *l*: it is Lith. *dėveris*, A. S. *tācor* (apparently lost in English), O. H. G. *zeihhur*. It has been mentioned that \sqrt{div} in Sanskrit means to play—and hence *devar* might mean a playmate—if so, this secondary sense must be also Indo-European. The word would seem to have been restricted in India to the younger brothers of the husband; which would suit the above etymology: this is curious, for it would seem to point to very early marriages among the primitive people, as well as among the Hindus: if the bride were a child, the younger brothers of the future husband might be fairly called her “playmates.” This peculiar kind of courtesy, by which all persons spoken of are represented as standing in some complimentary relation to the person addressed, is altogether Indian: but it was not probable that we should find it to be also stereotyped in words which became current throughout Europe. Fick¹ explains the word as derived from a $\sqrt{dā}$, to divide, and so meaning “partner.” This is improbable as to the form and unsatisfactory as to the sense.

It seems a fair conclusion from the fixity of the less

forms in particular tenses only; e.g. \sqrt{Fid} as an aorist, \sqrt{Fop} as a present, where the reason is clear enough; recognition is a momentary act, looking out warily is continuous. Again $\sqrt{\phi\alpha\gamma}$, $\epsilon\phi\alpha\gamma\omega\nu$ (Sk. *bhag*) is to divide, and so to “break bread,” but $\sqrt{\epsilon\delta}$ (*estlw*) is to eat it. We cannot trace the difference in $\sqrt{\phi\epsilon\rho}$, $\sqrt{\epsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma\kappa}$, or in $\sqrt{\tau\rho\epsilon\chi}$, $\sqrt{\delta\rho\alpha\mu}$.

¹ *Einheit*, &c. p. 270.

necessary terms connected with marriage, that the custom had long been firmly established in the primitive race¹. The extraordinary number of such terms in a primitive people's language may seem surprising: it certainly cannot be attributed to the necessities of a high civilisation; and is probably due to a clannishness which regards all within a certain pale as important, all beyond as barbarian².

Curtius thinks that the difficult word *yuvan* (whence Sk. *yuvan* and the secondary Lat. *iuvenis* come, and with which Gothic *juggs* our "young" are connected) is from the same root. The meeting of the two semivowels *y* and *v* in the same root seems to him fully to account for differences of form. Fick objects that there is no loss of *d* before *y* in Sanskrit; which is a weighty objection: that *dīp* "to play" is not Indo-European; which however is not true if the above etymology of *devar* be accepted: lastly, that the sense does not suit; that *iuvenis* is a man, not one who plays: but this transition is possible.

The fact that the Indo-Europeans were not mere nomad shepherds but settled in fixed abodes, may be established by the appearance among so many of the peoples of the same word for a home. Thus *dama* is attested as the original form by the Sk. *damas*, Gr. *δόμος*, Lat. *domus*, and Slav. *domu*: while the Gothic *timrja* a "builder," the German *zimmer*, and our "timber," are all probably akin. We cannot of course infer that the houses of that time were built of timber: rather timber was, in its primary signification, "building material." The house possessed a door, called *dhvar* or *dhvara* (*θύρα*, *fores*—base *fori*—, Goth. *daura* our "door"): which is of some importance as shewing that the long covered and half underground

¹ See Pictet, *Origines Indo-Européennes*, II. 331—375.

² Prof. Cowell tells me that the ridiculous poverty of our vocabulary in this respect calls forth the contempt of the modern Hindu; thus with us the same term "sister-in-law" is applied to a husband's sister, or a wife's sister, or a brother's wife, and is even extended to a husband's brother's wife, or a wife's brother's wife.

entrance to the hut—common to the Northern Asiatic tribes—was no longer used by the Indo-Europeans.

B.

Original B ought, on the analogy of the other soft consonants, to be represented by Sk. *b*, *bh*, Gr. *β*, Lat. *b*, Goth. *p*, O. H. G. *f*, and Lith. *b*. But it is very remarkable that there are hardly any instances where a word can be traced in the required forms through even a few of these languages. There seems to be absolutely no instance where the Gothic *p* occurs so as to correspond to a Greek and Latin *b*: almost every word that begins with *p* is borrowed from the Greek, and therefore corresponds to Greek *π*. *Paida* (a coat), the Greek *βαίτη*, may be an exception: the double change speaks rather for it: so that the original form would be *baita*: but we have no help from other languages. From this Grassmann concludes¹ that *b* (at all events as an initial sound) was not in use before the separation of languages (an exception being made in the case of some obviously onomatopoetic words, as Gr. *βλήχω*, Lat. *ballo*, Germ. *blöke*, Slav. *bleja*, our “bleat”), and that consequently the words found in those languages with initial *b* must have corrupted it from some other sound. This can be shewn of the Greek and Latin in a great number of cases, which will come under our consideration when I describe the phonetic laws of those languages at length. Thus (to take one or two examples) *βαρύς* was once *γβαρυς*, Lat. *gravis*: *βορά* was *γβορα*, Lat. (*g*)*vorare*: in *βούλομαι*, *βελτίων*, and others, the *β* is a dialectical hardening, difficult to account for, of *v*, while the same hardening in *βρίζα*, *βρέχω*, &c. was caused by the following *r*: in *βροτός* and others the *β* is parasitic and sprang up between *μ* and *ρ* (*μροτός*), the first of which it afterwards displaced: lastly, initial *b* is sometimes a corruption of *bh*, as in *βρέμω*, and the Lat. *balaena*, where the Greek

¹ *Zeitschrift*, XII. 122.

exhibits *φάλαινα*. There may be one or two exceptions: thus we have *buk* in Sanskrit to express the noise made by a lion or a dog: we have the *βύκται ἄνεμοι* of Homer¹; *bucca* the inner cheek, *βυκάνη* better known as *bucina*. Fick² compares the German *pfauchen*, and a Platt Deutsch *pochen* or *puchen*, to make a noise, on the authority of Pauli: these instances would seem to point out a true root BUK, which was no doubt originally onomatopoeitic, and that at a late time, but which yet ceased to be used as a conscious imitation of a particular sound, and therefore is as real a root (in the common sense) as any of which we have been speaking. Another root BARGH to "pluck," may be implied by *βραχύς*, *brewis*, Slav. *brŭzŭ* (=quick), and our own word combined with German *pflücken*³. This indeed is singularly slight evidence for the existence of *b* in the original language. But Schleicher's pleas for it have weight⁴, that it is assumed by the aspirate *bh*, which is later, and yet certainly Indo-European: and the improbability of its not belonging to the original speech, while it is yet found in all the derived speeches.

From the hard and soft unaspirated momentary sounds or "checks," we pass to the aspirates. Here we find the assumed aspirates of the original speech are not represented in the derived languages with nearly so much regularity as we have hitherto found. The reason is to be found in the peculiar nature of the sounds⁵. Before however considering their representation, one or two points connected with them must be briefly discussed. Since the weak aspirates are found in so few of the derived languages—in no one European member of the

3. *Aspirates.*

¹ *Od.* x. 20.

² p. 132.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ Compare the following statement from Cleasby's *Icelandic Dict.* i. 49: "*B* represents *p* in Scandinavian roots, for probably all words and syllables beginning with *p* are of foreign extraction; and the same is probably the case in German and English and all the branches of the Teutonic (*Grimm*, III. 414): whereas in Greek and Latin *p* is the chief letter, containing about a seventh of the vocabulary, while *b* contains from one-seventieth to one-ninetieth only."

⁵ As described at p. 65.

CH. V.

family; and since the hard aspirates are found in Greek, are we justified in assuming that *gh*, *dh*, *bh*, are the original forms of the aspirates, and not *kh*, *th*, *ph*? This latter view is actually adopted by some philologists in order to avoid the obvious difficulty of deriving stronger from weaker aspirates: and this is by far the weightiest in the list of the arguments in its favour which are stated by Prof. Kuhn¹, and are answered seriatim by Prof. Curtius². But this difficulty is at least in great part removed by regarding the aspirates as developable into compound sounds, which act upon each other like all other combinations. This action will be seen when we treat of the Greek aspirates. If the final breath of the soft aspirates could pass into the closely connected spiritus asper, the change from *gh* to *kh* is simply an assimilation of the *g* by the *h*, just as *g* is assimilated by the *t* in *actus* (\sqrt{ag}).

Did the
original
language
possess
hard as
well as soft
aspirates?

But may not both classes of aspirates have existed in Indo-European times, as both are found in the Sanskrit? Yet this theory will not entirely solve the problem, for the hard aspirates in Greek correspond generally to the soft aspirates in Sanskrit, and these soft aspirates are not likely to have been weakened forms peculiar to Sanskrit; still the change becomes at least less violent and extensive. This view has been very powerfully supported by Prof. Grassmann³. He points out that the soft aspirates of the Sanskrit are found in Keltic, Gothic, Lithuanian, and Slavonic, as soft unaspirated letters: also in the same languages the hard aspirates of the Sanskrit appear as hard unaspirated sounds (except in Gothic where they are sometimes treated as the Sanskrit hards), but at all events they never appear as soft sounds. Each aspirated sound would seem to have simply lost its breath, but never passed from hard to soft, or vice versa. This

¹ In his review of Schleicher's *Compendium*, *Zeitschrift*, x. 302.

² *Gr. Et.* 391.

³ *Zeitsch.* xii. 82, &c.

difference, he argues, speaks for a different origin of the two classes. Similarly in Latin the soft aspirates of the Sanskrit appear as soft letters, or as *h* or *f*, though *f* is indeed generally a hard breath. Yet in Latin he believes it to have had a weaker sound originally, from its frequent interchange with *b* (as *fui*, but *ama-bam*, *rufus*, and *ruber*), and from its being represented by the symbol of the Greek Digamma. In any case this *f* is found only at the beginning of words: and as a general rule the Latin represents the soft aspirate by a soft unaspirated letter. In Greek these soft aspirates appear regularly, as χ , θ , ϕ : but in any case where the aspiration is lost (e.g. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$, Sanskrit *mahat* for *maghat*) the representant is always a soft, never a hard letter—(thus pointing incidentally to the fact that the Greek aspirate even after the separation was at first a soft sound, though afterwards hardened)—while the exchange which we find in Greek between the hard aspirated and unaspirated letter, is mostly confined to the cases where the aspirate corresponds to the *hard* aspirate of Sanskrit: e.g. in Sanskrit we have the root *sphar*, to jerk, or vibrate¹, cognate to which is the Greek $\sigma\phi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha$ and also $\sigma\pi\alpha\iota\rho\omega$, where there is no aspirate: and there is a considerable number of cases where the Greek and Sanskrit hard aspirate are found in correspondence, e.g. $\omicron\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$ = *vet-tha*. From all this he concludes that the hard aspirates of the Sanskrit existed in the common speech, before the separation of Greek and Sanskrit. Did they exist still earlier? No information can be got from Keltic, Lithuanian, or Sclavonian, for in them the hard letters correspond to Sanskrit hard aspirated and unaspirated letters. But in the Gothic he seems to see a distinction between the Sanskrit hard and soft aspirates: namely, that Sanskrit *th*, *dh*, *t* = Goth. *t*, *d*, *th* respectively: thus the Sanskrit termination of the 2 sing. perfect, *-tha* (Greek $\theta\alpha$), is in Goth. *-t*: the Sanskrit participle termination

¹ See p. 114. This question of course does not affect the relations there given.

-tas=Gothic -ths : while in the cases—which are many—where this correspondence does not hold, and where *th* is found both in Sanskrit and Gothic, he holds the *th* to be a later development of the Sanskrit: which is indeed the principle which other scholars apply to explain the whole class of Sanskrit hard aspirates. On this evidence then from the Gothic he considers the hard aspirates to date back to the times before the first separation of languages.

How then is the confusion in Greek of the two originally distinct classes of aspirates, which the Hindus retained distinct, to be explained? Prof. Grassman¹ considers this phenomenon to be in accordance with the genius of the Greek language, which develops the vowel-system, but allows the consonants to decay². Consequently the aspirates had a tendency to become all hard or all soft. After σ they were obliged to remain hard: in analogy with this, the soft aspirates at the beginning of words first became hard, whilst those within words remained much longer soft, but finally hardened also,

In all this there seems to me nothing impossible. The evidence indeed supplied by the Gothic is insufficient to carry back the hard aspirates to the times before the separation of the North-Western family of nations. But at least a strong *prima facie* case has been made out for their occurrence before the parting of the South-Western peoples. The question which is left to be decided is this: is the number of words containing a hard aspirate and common to the Greek and the Sanskrit—e.g. $\kappa\acute{o}\gamma\chi\eta$ = *çankha*—sufficiently great to force us to believe that they must have belonged to the common language before the division, and not developed in the different languages, after the division, from causes which acted equally on

¹ *Zeitschrift*, p. 99.

² This decay indeed, at least of radical consonants, is more apparent than real. They are corrupted undoubtedly, but with considerable regularity and are generally recoverable in some of the derivatives. See the account of Greek consonantal change.

each? In the example given above there is no appearance of any such cause, and the difficulty of believing that the Greeks and Hindus separately aspirated the *k* is greater in this particular case than that of supposing that it was aspirated by their common ancestors. But in a large number of cases we may trace a cause which might easily affect both peoples, though not necessarily to the same degree: most important of these is an *s* preceding the hard letter; which we know produced numerous aspirates in Sanskrit after the separation, and which may therefore well have exerted something of the same power in Greece. This would account for coincidences like that between Sanskrit *sphal* and *σφάλω*: perhaps even for the *θ* in *οἶσ-θα*: and other less obvious phonetic influences may well have acted in other places.

Prof. Curtius rejects Grassmann's hypothesis, though doubtfully, on the ground that such questions must be decided, not by comparison of a few isolated words in different languages, but by examining the consonantal systems of the languages as a whole: from which he sees that corresponding to the Greek hard aspirates there appear, as a rule, soft letters in all the other families: and he concludes that it is much more probable that the Greek aspirates should be isolated examples of strengthening soft original sounds, than that all the other languages should have weakened the original hard aspirates so completely as to leave no trace behind of intermediate *k*, *t*, *p*, through which in some cases at least they must have passed¹.

I shall now give the representatives of these sounds, which all are agreed in attributing to the early alphabet—the soft aspirates. In order that the substitution may be intelligible, I may be allowed to repeat that it is the separation of the breath from the momentary sound which operated in different ways upon the aspirates in Europe. Sometimes they became fricative letters—*h*, *th*, *z*, *f*, &c.—

¹ *Gr. Et.* 392.

in consequence of the breath being strengthened: sometimes the breath was lost and the unaspirated consonant was left. Their history in Greece has been already alluded to, but will be more fully described in its place; it was different from that of any other European language. But everywhere in Europe, I believe, the sound developed itself into a real *compound*: and as such became stronger than the corresponding unaspirated letter: *g'h* became *g + h*. In India, on the other hand, and we believe in the original language, we have the true aspirate, *g'h*; which is weaker than the unaspirated letter, because based on a less complete contact.

GH.

(Indo-Eur. *GH* = Sk. *gh*, *h* = Gr. *χ* = Lat. *h* (initial), *ġ* (medial) = Goth. *g* = O. H. G. *g*, *k* = Lith. *g*. *ž*.)

There has been little change of meaning, though much apparent change of form, in the derivatives of *VAGH* to "carry." It is the Sanskrit *√vah* (where as constantly in Sanskrit the *h* seems to have driven the medial out of the field), the Greek *√φεχ* (distinct from *√σεχ*, whence *ἔσχω*), Lat. *√veh* (where the *h* must still have had some guttural sound, or it would not have assimilated itself to a subsequent hard, as in *uec-tum*, &c., and therefore differed from the *h* which the Romans took from Cumae with the Greek alphabet, where it was a weakening from spirants, not aspirates), Goth. *√vag*, Lith. *√vez*. A carriage is *vah-ana-m*, *ὄχο-ς*, *uehi-culu-m*, *vež-ima-s* (each of the four languages forming the noun by its own peculiar suffix), the German *wagen* and our "waggon" and "wain:" and *uia* (= *veh-ya*), Goth. *vigs*, denotes a "way" in two of the languages: *ὄχλος* and *vah-a-tí*, a Sanskrit word for a river, have no parallels in the other languages¹.

The Greek base *χάμα*, shewn in many cases which in consequence of the loss of the nominative are called

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 169.

adverbs, e.g. χαμαί, χαμόθεν and χαμᾶθεν, χαμᾶζε, &c., the Lat. *humus*, the Lith. *žėme* land, with Zend *zem*, shew an original *gham* or *ghama*, meaning earth. From this comes apparently *ghaman*, an inhabitant of the earth. It is the source of *homo(n)*, of Lith. *žmū*, of Gothic and A. S. *guma*, Norse *gumi*; whence German *brautigam*, Norwegian *brudgom*, our bride“groom¹.” The *r* is curious: it is probably due to that in preceding syllable, which was itself fluctuating: when “bird” passed into “bride,” the *r* may have arisen after the *g*, either by assimilation, or as a sort of compensation to the latter part of the compound for the removal of the *r* sound to the beginning. The possibility of this would be increased by the loss of the simple word in ordinary use: then the phonetic process would be helped on by the striving for clearness of meaning, shewing itself in finding a derivation for a word which clearly demanded one.

The colour “green” is denoted by words so obviously identical in the derived languages that we must refer them to a common origin, a root GHAR; which however is probably distinct from the root of the same form expressing “desire” or “pleasure” which occurs in the Greek χαίρειν, Latin *gratus*, German *gierig*, and our “greedy².” Thus grass is χλόη, and žole in Lithuanian: and vegetables are *holera* in Latin and *zel-ije* in Slavonic, English “colewort” and “sea-kail:” and “grass-colour” is in Sanskrit *hari*, Greek χλωρός, Latin *hel-uos*, O. H. G. *grôni*, our “green³.” *Giluos*, though agreeing in meaning, seems to belong to another root: whence also our “yellow;” the two colours easily pass one into the other. This same root GHAR, according to Curtius⁴, gives us χρυσός (for

¹ Fick, 359; *Gr. Et.* No. 180.

² Prof. Max Müller assigns to this root the original meaning of “fatness” (*Lect.* II. 381), Prof. Sonne “light;” and no doubt pleasure is a secondary idea derived from one of these or some other similar notion. The derivation of the Indian “Harits” and the Greek Χάριτες from this root (*Id.* II. 369) seems to me very probable.

³ *Gr. Et.* No. 197.

⁴ No. 185.

χρῡτ-yo-s, original *ghart-ya*). Gold therefore was yellow to the Indo-European eye, not red as in our old ballads. The same word had a worse fate in Latin where it became the yellow dirt, i.e. (*h*)*lut-um*. It is the Gothic *gultha*, and our "gold." Fick¹ would also connect with this base the word *rutilus*: this would agree with the application of the word to yellow flaxen hair; *ruber*, I think, is not so used: and it avoids the difficulty of three different letters being found in derivatives of the same base, *ruber*, *rufus*, and *rutilus*: Corssen however explains the last as being *rud-tilus*², and derives them all from RUHD.

Our ancestors would seem to have been troubled by snakes: they had formed from the root AGH (=to choke) the noun *aghi* to denote the reptile³. This appears in Sanskrit as *ahi*, in Greek as ἔχι-ς, Latin *angui-s* (where the radical AGH has, as always in Latin, been strengthened by the nasal; compare *angor*, *angustus*, *anxius*, &c.), and Lith. *angi-s*. The O. H. G. *unc*, an adder, does not shew the same suffix; ἔχι-δνα has sunk to the latter signification: and ἔγχελυς an "eel" apparently reminded the Greeks of the original snake, but, as we know from Aristophanes, carried also with it more pleasant associations. The same root gives ἄρχω, and ἀρχόνη, and the adverbs ἄρχι and ἀρχοῦ: all these have the primary sensuous meaning: but ἄχος is abstract, and so are the secondaries ἄχ-θ-ος and ἄχ-θ-ο-μαι. The Anglo-Saxon recalls the Greek in *ange*, vexation, and it has the curious prefix *ang*, meaning difficult, in compounds. One is *ang-naiġl*, a sore under the nail, in old English *agnail*, and now commonly (by mistaken etymology) "hangnail." *Egeo* and *ind-igeo* are probably also connected.

DH.

(Indo-Eur. DH = Sk. *dh* = Gr. *θ* = Lat. *f* (initial), *d* (medial) = Goth. *d* = O. H. G. *t* = Lith. *d*.)

¹ p. 69.² l. 369.³ Gr. Et. No. 172.

This letter is found in many rather curious and interesting roots. One of these is DHA, to “milk”—to be distinguished from the same combination of sound which means to “place,” and becomes in Greek the important root *θε*. Of course it is quite possible that the idea to “milk” may have been expressed simply by saying “to place to the breast:” but this is quite uncertain; the two ideas may have been originally represented by very different combinations of sound which at a time beyond the reach of our investigation, and by the operation of laws which we cannot discover, became identical. At all events for etymological purposes they are practically distinct roots: the derivatives of the one must be kept distinct from the derivatives of the other. DHA (to milk) is always found in Greek with the vowel long, agreeing in the main with Sanskrit in this respect. Thus it occurs in the rare verb *θησθαι*¹, and in the same neuter sense as it has in Sanskrit: but in one of the Homeric Hymns² it has the active sense which I imagine to have originally belonged to the root—*οὐδ’ ἄρ’ Ἀπόλλωνα χρυσάορα θήσατο μήτηρ*. The nouns formed in Greek from the root are numerous, as *θηλή*, *θηλυς*, *τι-θήνη*, &c., and probably also the proper name *Τη-θύς*. In Latin it is not quite certain whether *filius* should be attributed to this root, or to BHU (Latin *√fu*) to “be,” because the Latin confusedly represents both the dental and labial aspirate at the beginning of a word by *f*: the former view is taken by Curtius³, the latter by Corssen⁴: and there is the same uncertainty about *femina*. In English “female” is a corruption of *femel*, from old French *femelle*, the diminutive of *femina*. But the root has certainly its Latin representative in *felo*=to suck. In Gothic we find *daddjan* “to give milk” in Mark xiii. 17: and *tāu* with the same sense in O. H. G. Curiously Sanskrit seems to be the only language which has applied

¹ E.g. *Od.* iv. 89.³ *Gr. Et.* No. 307.² *To Apollo*, 123.⁴ *Kritische Beiträge*, 188.

this root to denote a cow—*dhenu*—obvious as the application might seem.

The simple root *DHA*, to place, is found in Sk. $\sqrt{dhā}$, and Greek *θε-ῖναι*, also in *con-do*, *ab-do*, &c. The secondary sense, of being engaged about a thing, is seen in the Teutonic family, A. S. *dōn*, our “do,” and German *thun* (for O. H. G. *tu-an*). Yet the primary sense may still be seen in old English, e.g. in the phrase to “do-on” clothes, or to “don” them; and the opposite, to “doff” them¹.

A rather obscure Greek root *θα* and its secondary $\sqrt{θαF}$, meaning to stare, or wonder at, is liable to be confused with the last in consequence of the loss of the final *v*. It does not seem to occur in any other language except in the Slavonic branch², nor is the verb found in Ionic Greek, except perhaps in *Od.* XVIII. 191—*ἄμβροτα δῶρα δίδου ἵνα μιν θησαλίαι*’ *Ἀχαιοί*—where Bekker’s emendation *θεσσαλίαι* (quoted by Curtius, *l. c.*) seems probable. But in Doric Greek the verb occurs frequently: *θᾶσθε τὰς ἀπιστίας* says the Megarian (*Ar. Ach.* 770), and in Theokritus the word is used for going to some sight or show³, and *θᾶσαι* means simply “look⁴” by the process of weakening mentioned above, by which a general idea is substituted for one more vivid and more restricted—a process found, I think, more among the less quick-witted Dorians than among the other Greeks: thus in Theokritus *ἔρπειν* (Indo-Eur. *SARP*, to creep) means simply to go⁵; however in Ionic and Attic too the primary sense is not infrequently lost. The nouns however derived from this root are not restricted to Doric, as *θαῦμα* (for *θαF-μα*) *θέα* (for *θεF-a*): *θαῦμα* indeed is sometimes derived from the following root *DHU*: the derivations are equally possible phonetically: but “staring” seems to denote wonder more naturally

¹ There is a curious parallelism here with the Latin: not only is *ab-do*, “I do af” or “off,” but *ab-did-i* is “I off-did.” Our “did” is a genuine example of a reduplicated perfect: it was *dide* (dissyllabic) in A. S. See Max Müller, *Lectures*, i. p. 233 (2nd edit.).

² *Gr. Et.* No. 308.

³ *II.* 72, xv. 23.

⁴ i. 149,

⁵ *VII.* 2, xv. 26, &c.

than "rapid motion" does. Fick¹ would refer $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ to a root DHI , to think; we have \sqrt{dhyai} in this sense in Sanskrit², and $dh\acute{i}$, a noun expressing mind. I think this much less probable. $\theta\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\omicron\varsigma$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\pi\alpha$ have been already referred to this family³.

The derivatives of the root DHU to "shake" or "move quickly" retain the original meaning with curiously different results. In Sanskrit from the lengthened form $\sqrt{dh\acute{u}}$ we have $dh\acute{u}ma$ = smoke, and $dh\acute{u}li$ "dust." In Greek $\sqrt{\theta\nu}$ gives us $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, in Homer of rushing winds and streams—the $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ $\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\alpha\pi\iota$ $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu$, or Skamandros $\omicron\acute{\iota}\delta\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\nu$; but the same verb was at the same time used for burning—apparently the connecting link is the flaming, or the quivering of the air about fire—and in post-Homeric times $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ is regularly used of "sacrificing." But the noun $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ seems from the earliest traceable times to have been confined to the movement of the soul; whilst $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ remained fixed to the earliest sense⁴, and $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ was attached to the derived idea of sacrifice. In Latin *fumus*, O. H. G. *toum*, Slav. *dymǔ* and our "dust" (originally *dunst*), is still retained for the primary sensuous idea of agitation. But the Slavonic has followed in the wake of the Greek by expressing the soul by *duša*; and the Lithuanian *dūma* denotes both thought and soul⁵.

Perhaps no Indo-European noun has preserved its form so perfectly during all its wanderings as *madhu*. It is the Sanskrit *madhu*, first meaning honey, then "a spirituous liquor extracted from the blossoms of the *Bassia latifolia*," according to Prof. Benfey's Sanskrit dictionary: in Greek it is $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon$, with no meaning but wine. The O. H. G. is

¹ p. 102.

² See, however, p. 115.

³ See p. 101.

⁴ Mr Paley (note to *IL*. XII. 253) connects $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ and $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ in the sense of motion with $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ to run and $\theta\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$, and derives them all from $\theta\epsilon\text{F}$. But surely this is impossible. From $\theta\epsilon\text{F}$ we can get only $\theta\epsilon\text{F}\omega$ or $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, not $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omega$. What analogy is there for such a formation? It is of course possible that there may have been two distinct roots, one "to rush" and one "to burn." But the ultimate Greek form of each must have been $\sqrt{\theta\nu}$.

⁵ *Gr. Et.* No. 320. Max Müller, II. 210.

metu, and the Anglo-Saxon *medo*—our “mead.” The Slav. *medu* and Lith. *midus* seem not to have passed beyond the signification of honey¹. The Gaelic *mil* also is honey only, and *mil-dheoch* (honey-drink) is required to denote mead: compare also Welsh *meddyglyn*, better known as metheglin. Prof. Curtius takes the primary meaning to have been—a sweet drink. It seems to me more likely that the primary meaning was honey, and that the North-Western peoples parted from the common stock before the word had got any other meaning; the invention of mead being thus left to our Teutonic forefathers’ unaided ingenuity. The word reached its next stage of a sweet, and then intoxicating drink, before the separation of the Aryan and South European peoples: and never passed beyond this stage in India, a country where the palm supplies most of the spirituous liquor consumed and where grapes are grown only as a garden fruit². But in Greece, a vine-growing country, the signification “wine” once attained, had driven out all others before the days of Homer.

BH.

(Indo-Eur. BH = Sk. *bh* = Gk. ϕ = Lat. *f* (initial), *b* (medial) = Goth. *b* = O. H. G. *b*, *p* = Lith. *b*.)

Considering the fact above mentioned that B is found in no certain Indo-European root, it is certainly not a little surprising that BH is found in some of the most common, such as BHA “to give light” (the lengthened forms of which have been already mentioned), BHU “to be,” and BHAR “to bear.” The derivatives of BHU are too well known and have varied too little from the radical idea to need much description. I may mention however the participle *bhavant*, which is found in a restricted sense—a human “being”—in Sanskrit and Greek: compare also

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 322.

² Elphinstone’s *India*, Vol. I. pp. 10, 14.

our own use of the participle. In Sanskrit it is used as a respectful periphrasis for a person spoken to. Thus, instead of saying "Do this," the polite phrase is "Let the being (= his excellency) do this." There is nothing however of this sense in the Greek $\phi\acute{\omega}(\tau)\varsigma$ i.e. $\phi\alpha\tau\text{-}\alpha\tau\text{-}\varsigma$. The derivatives of BHAR are very different in the different languages. Thus while in Sanskrit the primary idea of "bearing" has passed in the main part of the derivatives into that of supporting and of nourishing; and while in Gothic *bairan* has the secondary sense of "bearing children"—compare the Scotch "bairn;"—in Greek there is no important variant from the simplest sense of carrying except $\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ meaning tribute. In the simple sense $\phi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha$ is a means of carrying arrows: and $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ a means of carrying a dead man: the distinction is clearly phonetic. In Latin, on the contrary, the root has been very prolific: beside *fer-ax* and *fer-tilis* we have probably *far*, corn, and *fors*, *for-tuna*, &c. that which brings our luck to us¹.

ARBH "to be active" appears in Sanskrit as \sqrt{rabh} , which has commonly the sense of desiring; but its most frequent compound *sam-ā-rabh* signifies to undertake. It appears as $\sqrt{\alpha\lambda\phi}$, i.e. to bring in, or yield, in the Homeric $\acute{\omega}\nu\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ and in the much discussed $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, probably "active, enterprising men." In Latin we have *labor* and all its derivatives: in Gothic *arbaiths* in the same sense, the modern German *arbeit*: and the Slavonian *rabu* is a "servant²." *Earfoð*, a difficulty, is Anglo-Saxon: and the Old English *arrfeþþ*, difficult, occurs in the *Ormulum*.

While we find little agreement among the different peoples in the terms by which they denote the sun, moon, and heaven—a fact which perhaps may point out to us that the Indo-Europeans lived in a country where man was to a great extent independent of the atmospheric conditions, and not subdued by them,—yet they all agree in their name for the cloud. The Sanskrit *nabhas* is the

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 411.

² *Ib.* No. 398.

Greek νέφος: the Latin *nubes*¹, and *nebula*, and the German *nebel*, are cognate formations: and the Slavonic *nebo* is the sky². This agreement is curious, and rather difficult to explain.

The Indo-European *bhratar*, brother, is found with slight difference in all the peoples: the Greek φρατήρ alone has slightly changed, or widened its sense: whereby the use of ἀδελφός was rendered necessary for the simpler relationship. Here we see that the suffix *-tar*—found in the Greek *-τερ* or *-τορ* and the Latin *-tor*—was used before the separation to denote relationship. It is not very easy to see the connection between this use of it and the other more common one to mark the agent³. Whether there were originally two distinct forms which by phonetic influence were confused together; or whether *-tar* first denoted the agent, and the different domestic relations were first conceived of as the performance of certain functions (so that *bhratar* meant originally the bearer or supporter, *patar* the protector, *matar* the producer)—is impossible for us to decide. One objection to the latter view lies in the somewhat artificial character of the derivations here given; the conceptions seem on the whole so little obvious or simple. No doubt there may have been originally a score of other words besides *patar* by which a father could be known, and *patar* may have driven them all out of the field by virtue of no superior merit as a conception, but from greater convenience of sound, or even some other more trifling reasons: such an elimination only requires time: and long time must have elapsed between the simple beginnings of primitive man upon the earth and the stage of development which the Indo-Europeans had attained when they first appear in that dim Eastern dawn of what is to us the world's history: and therefore the charge of artificiality against these derivations should go

¹ The *u* here is peculiar, and not quite satisfactorily explained by Corssen, or by Schmidt (*Vokalismus*, p. 199).

² *Ib.* No. 402.

³ See above, p. 56.

for no more than it is worth. Yet I confess I cannot help suspecting that these words, *patar* and *matar*, denoting as they each do one of the simplest and earliest relationships, may possibly have been a legacy received from a still more distant time, remnants of an utterly perished language, brought down in some simpler form, and afterwards fashioned by our forefathers, so as to lose what was strange in their appearance, and be capable of being referred to a known Indo-European root and suffix. Certainly the first syllable of each word seems marvellously like the language of nature.

I have thus given examples of the nine momentary sounds as they occur in roots and words presumably Indo-European. The continuous sounds, which we now proceed to consider, require less strength and distinctness in articulation. Hence they occur less frequently in roots than the strong explosive sounds, which were better fitted to express with firmness and precision the ideas produced by natural objects through the senses upon the mind of a quick and vigorous race. I shall begin with the nasals, because they have a close and obvious connection with the momentary sounds: we have seen that the position of the mouth-organs for each is the same as that for the corresponding explosive sound: but that, in addition, the nasal apertures of the pharynx are open. Consequently each language should possess as many nasal sounds as it has distinct classes of consonants produced at the different points of contact: thus in Sanskrit, which possesses two additional classes of consonants, the palatal and lingual, sounded between the guttural and the dental, each of these classes has its own nasal, distinguished like the other nasals by its own peculiar symbol; and so we find five nasal letters: Zend also had a guttural and a palatal nasal: but no European language has more than two symbols, though many have at least a third guttural sound, like that of *ng* at the end of English "sing," and a palatal nasal is also heard. It is not certain that any

II. Continuous Sounds.

1. Nasals,

except the dental and labial nasals were Indo-European: there is most evidence for the guttural, which occurs in Sanskrit, Zend, Greek and Gothic, though in the last two languages it was represented by a *g*. But there is no evidence that it could ever stand alone in any ancient language but Sanskrit; in all the others it is only found in contact with the guttural which produced it, as in ἄγ-χόνη, *angustus*. These two words, together with the Gothic *aggrus*¹ also meaning "narrow" and derived from the same root as the others, might seem to justify us in assuming an Indo-European root *ang* (where by *n* I denote the sound *ng*). But no stronger form is found in Sanskrit than *agha*, in the sense of "evil:" and the Greek also has the simpler √*ax*, as in ἄχος: a later origin must therefore be attributed to the nasal, in this and in similar cases.

The dental and labial nasals are found unaltered in all the languages. The only variety we find is in the Greek, Gothic, and Lithuanian, which take *n* at the end of a word where the other languages have *m*. The reason is obvious: *m*, which is pronounced with the lips firmly closed, is less fitted for the end of a word, where the tendency is always to let the lips part,

N.

From AN, to blow, we have *an-ila* in Sanskrit and ἄν-εμος in Greek meaning wind. Transferred to the spiritual world the Graeco-Italian *anemos* becomes *animus*, the spirit, in Latin. In Scotch "aynd" is breath (found in Barbour), and there is an old English word "onde²." The O. H. G. *unst*³ is the violent wind, while *anst* in Gothic denotes favour or grace: so curious is the interlacing of the physical and metaphysical in the derivatives of this root. In Sanskrit *anana* is the mouth, and then

¹ The symbol *g*, to denote the nasal, was of course borrowed from the Greek usage.

² As in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*; "she gaspeth with a drechinge onde," i.e. a labouring breath; given in Morris, *Specimens &c.* p. 275, ed. 2.

³ *Gr. Et.* No. 419.

like *os* comes to mean a face: and most probably the same meaning is found in *προσ-ηνής*, with face turned towards one, *ἀπηνής*, with averted face, *πρηνής*, with face bent forward, *ὑπήνη*, the part below the mouth. These etymologies are due to Prof. Benfey, who also connects *prāna*, which in Sanskrit signifies both breath and life, with the Greek *φρῆν* and *φροντίς*.

The severity of the winter in the original home of the Indo-European nations is shewn by their all having the same word for snow: except indeed the Hindu. The original root was SNIGH, which is retained in Sanskrit in the form *snih*, but it denotes viscosity, and the derivative *sneha* means first oil, then love. The Zend however has the root in its old sense: in Greek the guttural has passed into a labial, and we have *νίφας*, &c.: in Latin *ning-ere*, the first consonant being lost, as often, in Latin: the Gothic for "snow" is *snaivs*, the Lithuanian *snėgas*. The fact that the Indians alone allowed the word to pass out of its original sense shews that they passed into a climate the most unlike to that of the common fatherland. Their common word for snow is *hima*, whence *Himālaya*, the place where the snow lies: it comes from the root GHI, which has given the other languages their word for winter, *χειμών*, *hiemps*, Lithuanian *žėma*: the fact that *hima* was used by the Hindus to denote a number of other objects remarkable for whiteness and freshness—such as camphor, the pearl, the white lotus, and fresh butter¹—may shew that snow was to them an object to be admired from a distance rather than an inconvenience under foot. Some general inferences about the climate of our fatherland will be found in a note at the end of this chapter.

The agreement in the word for a daughter-in-law is curious. The Sk. *snushā*, Gr. *νύος*, Lat. *nurus*, and O. H. G. *snur*, and A. S. *snor*², point to the Indo-European form

¹ Benf. *Lex.* s.v.

² As in Matt. x. 35; and see Gr. *Et.* No. 444.

snusa : which may not unlikely have originally been *sunu-sa*, a derivative from *sunu*, “a son” (which is a Sanskrit form from *SU*, “to beget ;” whence *υῖός*=*su-yo-s*).

A man was *nar* or *nara*. We have it in Sanskrit *nri*, in *ἀ-νερ*, and it is found in all the Italian dialects as *ner*, except in Latin, where it seems to have been superseded by *wir*. It is the Sabine name *Nero* ; and *Nerius* is a secondary form. The Welsh *nerth*, Irish *nert*, mean manliness¹. These words belong to the class which can be best relied upon to shew the affinity of the Keltic to the other European languages: the identity of the root is certain and the formation seems independent: therefore they were not merely borrowed words.

M.

The labial-nasal is found in the root *MAR*, which with its strengthened forms *MARD*, and *MARP*—if this latter be really connected with it—is well known from the full and interesting discussion it has received from Max Müller in his second series of lectures. It appears most commonly in Greek and Latin as *√mor* (or *√μφο* in Greek as *ἄ-μ(β)πο-ρος*), and mostly restricted to the sense of death. Our “murder” is to be seen in the Gothic *maurthr*.

One of the most important roots in the language is *MAN*, to think. This root indeed, as we have already seen, is only a secondary, modified form of *MA*, to measure (whence comes *ma-ta* which the Sanskrit grammars give as the past participle of *man*, and *ma-ti*, thought): but it is undoubtedly older than the time of the separation. In the Sanskrit and in all the North-European languages, the derivatives of this verb signify nothing but operations of the mind, as thought and memory: in old German *minna* is love, whence the minne-singers. In Anglo-Saxon *myn* is love, and *myne* “mind,” memory. But in Latin the root is applied in its simplest form—*man-ere*—and in Greek almost its simplest—*μέν-ειν*—to express what is

¹ See Ebel, p. 108 ; Fick, 110.

apparently a much more concrete idea—to remain. Which is the primary sense? It has already been incidentally mentioned that the concrete signification of a verb or noun, as a rule, always precedes the abstract: for example, VAR meant to look “warily” before ὥρα (strengthened derivative from For, whence ὄρ-άω) meant caution, anxiety; or *ver-eor* meant to be afraid. Has then this root reversed the ordinary process? The fact, that no trace is left in the Teutonic and Slavonic speeches of any original sense “to remain,” is strongly against that having been the primary sense of the root. Probably no root has ever passed from a particular to a general signification without leaving some trace behind in some of its derivatives of its original meaning. How then can we explain this exception to the rule? According to Prof. Curtius¹ the root, starting with the idea of thought, took three main directions: (1) active, yearning thought, as seen in the Homeric μέ-μον-α, and also in μένος, which at first was active purpose of the soul—the μένος καὶ θυμός of the Homeric heroes—and then by association passed into the idea of bodily strength: and the cognate μαίωμα (=μα-γο-μαι) has the same meaning: (2) excited thought; whence μαίνομαι, μῆνις and μάντις, all denoting the carrying a man out of himself by power of thought; and here, on this theory, come μένω and *man-eo*, when a man is so filled with thought that he stands stock-still: (3) backward thought, remembering and admonishing, whence the proper name Μεν-τωρ, the adviser, Μοῦσα (i.e. Μουσα, the teacher); and the numerous list of Latin derivatives, *men-tio*, *mon-eo*, *mons-trum* (for *mon-es-trum*, i.e. the warning), *reminiscor*, and many others. In *mentiri* and *mendax*² the idea has received a twist. This explanation seems to me the best that can be given of the inversion of the general rule. Prof. Curtius explains in the same way the parallel case of the Latin *mora*,

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 429; see also p. 99.

² On the form of this word, see Corssen, *Kritische Beiträge*, 118.

delay, which stands alone as a concrete noun among the numerous abstract derivatives from SMAR, "to remember," the Greek $\sqrt{\mu\epsilon\rho}$ in $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\text{-}\iota\mu\mu\alpha$, &c., Lat. \sqrt{mor} in *memoria*.

From the simple root MA, we have many secondaries beside those already mentioned. Thus we have MAD, still used in the primary sense in $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\text{-}\iota\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and *mod-us*, but in a secondary derived sense of regulating in $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$ and *moderor*. MADH denoted to measure something mentally, to consider, in $\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ and *meditor*, probably also *medicus* and *medeor*, with the further sense of special artistic skill, acquired by such consideration. It will be seen that the derivatives of these two secondaries are in form indistinguishable in Latin: so that we can only judge by the required meaning to which root they should be assigned. Lastly, we have MAR, to measure out, apportion, in $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and *mereo*; perhaps *mer-c-s* is a further secondary, or rather tertiary.

The nasals have played a very prominent part in the formation of suffixes. A list has been given above¹ of twenty-two simple suffixes, the majority of which can be traced by comparison through the different languages up to Indo-European days. Of these, three consist of the simple vowels, *a*, *i*, *u*, with no consonant at all. Out of the remaining nineteen, a nasal is found in eight; and, curiously enough, the dental *t* is found in no less than seven. In four the spirants are found, *r* in three, *k* and *dh* each in one; no other consonant occurs. This would seem to shew a facility of the *t* sound which we should not have looked for: since undoubtedly these suffixes must have been selected out of many other competitors to fill their post because of some proved lightness and convenience of sound, found in them more than in any other part of the mechanism of language. It is probable that we must look for the cause of this in the wide range through which this letter can be formed, i.e. by pressure of the tongue at any point from the mid-palate to the edge of

¹ See p. 52; see also Schleicher, *Comp.* p. 374, &c.

the teeth. That the sound varied to some extent in Greek and Latin pronunciation may be inferred from the fact that in each language the dentals have been much more corrupted than either of the other classes, neither of which admits of much looseness and uncertainty as to the point of contact. The preponderance of nasals in these suffixes is not surprising: they can be pronounced clearly with less effort than any other sound except *r* and *l*. Hence we have in frequent cases the suffixes *-ma*, *-man*, *-mant*, *vant*, *an*, *ana*, *na*, *ni*, *nu*.

We now come to the continuous fricative sounds, as opposed to the shut sounds (momentary and continuous) which we have been hitherto considering. Out of the much larger list of sounds the nature of which we examined¹, we have but four or five to consider now; four central, *Y*, *S*, *V*, *R*; and one lateral, *L*. As we have seen, *r* really belongs to the same class as *y* and *v*: but from its close connection with *l*, the two are often classed together as liquids, while the other three have received the convenient and not incorrect title of "spirants," which will be frequently applied to them in this book; but in reality *r* and even *l* have as good a title to the name. Of the first three, *y* and *v* are soft or sonant letters, the first palatal, the second labial or labio-dental: *s* is a hard letter. They have been retained uncorrupted in Sanskrit, and nearly so in the North-European languages: it is in the Zend, which however does not concern us, and in Greek and Latin (especially the former), that they have suffered most. Since therefore a full list of these variations must be given in their proper place, I shall give but few examples here of these sounds in primitive roots and words: just enough to shew that there really were such sounds as *y* and *v*, which would be a matter of great doubt to any mere Greek scholar from the absolute loss of the first letter, and slight traces left of the latter in the earliest stage of Greek.

2. *Fricatives or Spirants.*

¹ See pp. 74—79.

Y.

(Indo-Eur. *Y*=Sk. *y*=Gr. *ι, ε, ζ*, (')=Lat. *i=j* in all the other members of the family, except the English, the sound however being the same.)

The root YUG has given the common term for the "yoke" to all languages. It is the Sanskrit *yuga-m*—which however denotes more frequently a pair, or couple; the Greek *ζυγόν*, Lat. *iug-um*, Gothic *juk*, O. H. G. *joch*, Lithuanian *junga-s*. This would be good evidence of the employment of the Indo-Europeans as an agricultural people before the separation, if it were certain that the word meant at first a yoke, and not a pair. The same root gave the Latins their term for a wife—*con-iux*—compare the Greek *ὀμόζυξ*, the acre *iugerum*, and superlative *iuxta*, i.e. *iug-i-sta*, as Corssen ingeniously explains it¹, comparing *exta*=*ec-i-sta*, a superlative form beside *exterus*, *extra*.

A husband's brother's wife was called *yantar*. This was the Sanskrit *yātri* (the *a* being lengthened by compensation), and the Slav. *jetry*, where the lost nasal is indicated by the mark under the *e*. In Lithuanian, *intė* is a brother's wife. Thus we get the connecting link with *εἰνάρετες* and *ianitricēs*². The original meaning seems quite unattainable. Benfey connects the Latin and Greek words with Sanskrit *yāmātri*³, a daughter's husband: which is less satisfactory in meaning, and involves a change of nasals.

Time was certainly denoted by *yāra*: it is not quite certain whether it was a "year:" that is the sense of Zend *yāre*, Gothic *jer(a)*, Norw. *jaar*, and German *jahr*. In Slavonic however *jara* is spring: and the Greek *ἔρα* is inconclusive. Probably the word meant first of all a season, to be fixed at any length as suited the different peoples. In Sanskrit we have nothing nearer than *yā-tu*, formed by a different suffix, apparently from the secondary

¹ *Ausspr.* II. 549.

² Fick, 158; Gr. Et. No. 423, b.

³ *Lex.* s. v.

√*yá*, to go : so that the word would naturally mean “the past¹,” or, if a year was the primary sense, a “going” or revolution of the sun.

A term for soup, *yusa*, is given by Sk. *yusha*, and by *ius* : ζωμός shews a different suffix : but in Slavonic we have *jucha*, and *ch* in that language sometimes represents *s*. The root is doubtless YU, to mix. It will be seen that ζ frequently represents *y* in Greek. The letter indeed is most manifold in its shapes : beside the vowel-substitutes given in the heading, it also passes by assimilation into λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ, and τ, and is not seldom lost altogether. All these changes will be given in their places.

The pronominal stem “who” was formed in Indo-European by this letter as *ya-s*. Perhaps, as Curtius suggests², this stem itself was a secondary form derived from the simple pronominal stem *i*=that, Latin *i-s*, by the affix *a*, the radical vowel passing before it into the semi-vowel—this conjecture derives support from the Gothic method of forming the relative by adding *ei* to the demonstrative pronoun : thus *thata+ei* or *thatei*=which. The Sanskrit has kept this pronoun unchanged : the Greeks suffered the spirant to sink into the spiritus asper—δ-s, with its cases οὔ, ὅθεν, ὅθι, &c³. The Gothic, though forming its relative by a different rule, seems yet to have kept a trace of the old form in *jah*, which represents καί, γάρ and δέ in the Gospels : it was apparently a loose conjunctive pronoun like the Latin *que*. *Jabai*, which is commonly given as an example, may be *jah-ibai*⁴ : the Slavonic has the form pretty accurately—*ji-s*—but transferred it to the demonstrative. This variety of usage may shew that this secondary pronoun (if Prof. Curtius’ hypothesis be true) existed indeed before the separation of the North-Western peoples, but had not yet clearly separated itself in meaning from the demonstrative : and that the superior logic of

¹ Gr. Et. No. 522 ; Fick, 160.

² Gr. Et. No. 606.

³ This δ-s is radically different from the demonstrative δs (originally σφοs) found in the colloquial phrases καί δs, and ἦ δ’ δs.

⁴ See Skeat, *Gothic Glossary*, s. v.

the remaining peoples first gave it its distinct restricted meaning. In Greek the consciousness of this *y* remained till the days of Homer—as we find in the *Iliad* lines ending with *θεός ὤς*, &c., where the apparent irregularity is often explained by a supposed digamma: in truth it probably was no irregularity at the time when the line was first recited, but the sound of the *y* was still slightly heard. This ὤς was the ablative case of ὀ-ς and equivalent to the Sanskrit *yāt*, final *τ* in Greek always passing into *σ*: just as by the same loss of the *y*, *yāvat*="how much," is found in Greek in the very dissimilar form *ἄ-φος*, Doric *ἄς*, Attic *ἔως*¹.

The most frequent traces of this spirant are to be found in formative and case-suffixes². Thus the original comparative suffix *-yans*—probably once *-yant*, can be traced through the Sanskrit, e.g., *bhū-yams*=more; the Greek *-ιον*, as *κακιον*, though often much hidden by assimilation, of which more hereafter; *-ior*, earlier *ios*, as *maior*, for *mag-ior*; compare the Spanish *mayor*: and even the Gothic *is*=*jas* by a phonetic rule of the language (*i=ja*)³. A middle step, *jis*, seems to occur in *hwarjis*, the interrogative pronoun.

S.

(Indo-Eur. *S*. = Sk. *s*, *sh* = Gr. *σ*, () = Lat. *s*, *r* = Goth. *s*, *z* = O. H. G. *s*, *r* = Lith. *s*.)

The sound of original *s* was probably hard, not the corresponding soft *z* which is often denoted by the same

¹ Delbrück (Curtius, *Studien*, II. 2. 193) argues with much acuteness that the *ā* was a Sanskrit variation and that the first vowel was originally short. He takes the analogy of *βασιλεῖ-ος*, &c., and considers that sometimes the *e* was changed to *η* (*βασιληῖος*) by the common backward action of a vocalised spirant; but the Ionic, which still retained the consciousness of *y* and *v*, could let the change act forward and make *βασιλέως*, at pleasure, as well as the other; and the Attic Greek adopted it; so also the *ἔως* we are now considering.

This therefore furnishes an explanation of these vowel changes, different from "compensation;" see Chapter I. page 4.

² See page 52.

³ Schleicher, *Comp.* 479—484.

symbol. The letter is preserved in every language in some of the forms derived from AS to "be." In Sanskrit we have the primitive form: in Greek and Latin it appears as \sqrt{es} , (e) s -um: in Gothic the original vowel is seen as i , and this language also (like Latin and Greek) has corrupted the first person into im , but kept the s in the third person ist , our own "is." The Lithuanian, which has preserved the conjugational suffixes with remarkable accuracy, still exhibits $es-mi$ and $es-ti$. The root no doubt meant originally to breathe, though perhaps no language but the Sanskrit has any derivative bearing that sense¹. The root was used in Sanskrit and in Greek to express moral ideas: thus (a) sat the participle signifies "true" (really existing) and "good;" and to the same process is probably due the same sense of the Homeric $\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ (for $\epsilon\varsigma$ - v - s , the suffix being different), and the common $\epsilon\upsilon$, "well," to which the Sanskrit prefix su - is precisely parallel. The correspondence of form and sense between $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{o}s$ and sat - ya - s points strongly to their common derivation from this root².

The roots for sewing and spinning—SIV and NADH—(as Mommsen has pointed out³) are alike in all Indo-European languages; though at the same time he denies to our forefathers the further accomplishment of weaving. The former—SIV—is not indeed very recognisable in Greek. Both in Greek and Latin the i has been lost, because the v was resolved into the vowel u (Latin su - o , $sutor$, &c.), and therefore one of the two vowels was obliged to fall out; and the root is then probably to be found in $\kappa\alpha\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\omega = \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\sigma\upsilon$ - ω , which is restricted however to the

¹ See M. Müller, *Lect.* II. 249.

² *Gr. Et.* No. 564. Fick however (p. 186) connects these words with Sanskrit $vasu$ meaning "goods," wealth, which may perhaps once have meant good, as an adjective. He explains $\eta\upsilon\varsigma$ by a prosthetic ϵ before the v , i. e. ϵ - $\Phi\epsilon\upsilon$. But the η may be equally well due to the lost s . The Sanskrit analogies seem to me almost decisive for the explanation given in the text.

³ *Hist. Rome*, I. 17.

cobbler's stitch. From NADH comes Gothic *nethla*, our "needle."

In the greater number of roots, however, the *s* must be inferred by the classical scholar chiefly from the kindred languages, as it commonly drops out altogether between two vowels in Greek, and in Latin under similar circumstances passes into *r*. Thus the root *us* "to burn" is authenticated by the Sanskrit and Zend \sqrt{ush} , and Latin \sqrt{us} in *us-tum*. But no nearer forms occur in Greek than the Homeric $\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ (for $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omega$), meaning to singe pigs, and $\alpha\upsilon\omega$, to dry, whence $\alpha\upsilon\sigma$ and $\alpha\upsilon\chi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$. If, as Professor Curtius thinks¹, the root points back to an older form *vas*, it may be better to connect with it, as he does, the name Hestia—Vesta—almost the only divinity not Indo-European², yet from the first common to both the Greek and Italian nations—rather than with *vas* to "dwell," the root which gave the Greek $\phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$, and the Latin *verna*, the house-born slave. But, if so, *vas* sank to *us* in Indo-European times, as is proved by the widely-spread derivatives of that form. The hot wind, *E\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma*, and *Auster*, are clearly from this root: the different forms which the vowel has taken will be discussed in the chapter on vowel-intensification. Curtius also connects $\eta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with the same root³, making the original form of the word $\alpha\upsilon(\sigma)\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$; then the *v* either fell out altogether, as in the common Greek $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$, or hardened itself into β as in the Cretan $\acute{\alpha}\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$. If this be so, as seems in the highest degree probable, there can be no hesitation in identifying with this Greek $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ the Latin proper name Aurelius, the older form of which was Auselius; and very curious in this connection is the old legend respecting the Aurelian family, that they were descended from the sun⁴. The last Graeco-Italian word connected with this root is *Ausos*, the morning—which became on the one side the Aeolic $\alpha\upsilon\omega\varsigma$, Doric $\acute{\alpha}\omega\varsigma$, Ionic $\eta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, and Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ —where the rough breathing

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 610.

² Mommsen, *Hist. Rome*, i. 21.

³ *Gr. Et.* No. 612.

⁴ Paul. *Epit.* 23, quoted by Curtius.

seems to be due, as often, to Athenian Cockneydom;—on the other side, by the addition of a secondary suffix, the Latin *Ausos-a* or *Aurora*. The Sk. *ushas* and Zend *usha* both denote the morning; also the Lith. *auszra*, where the vowel has been raised as in the Graeco-Italian. The German Oest and our East are from the same root, and denote the morning-land¹.

V.

(Indo-Eur. *V.* = Sk. *v* = Gr. *υ*, *ϕ*, (*υ*) = Lat. *u* = *v* in all others.)

A root *VAS*, to dwell, has been already mentioned. Another root of the same form signifies to clothe. I say another, because although of course it is possible to conceive that each of these significations was developed

¹ The word *ἠώς* is derived by Mr Paley (*Iliad*, xi. 1) from the "root *αϕ*, the same as in *δῆρ*, *ἀήρης*, and connected with *ϕαϕ* (*φάος*)." In the preface to the first edition of this work I objected to this as an instance of unscientific etymology. The scientific method, as I understand it, consists in putting side by side words which have the same or a cognate meaning in languages known to be related to each other; then in examining whether these words, tried each by the recognised phonetic laws of its own language, lead up to the same root. If thus correspondence both of *sense* and *form* is then found in two languages, the words are probably identical; if in three or four languages, the probability is immensely increased; and we reach as high a degree of probability (or practical certainty) as is possible in any experimental science, according to the number of instances which can be adduced. This method has been followed in the derivation of *ἠώς* from *us*. It is highly probable, from the two forms *αἰώς*, and *Aurora*, considered in the light of the phonetic laws of the two languages; and it becomes practically certain when *ushas* and *auszra* are added; when we have four words agreeing in meaning, slightly differing in form, and all regularly derivable from *us*, but not, so far as I know, from any other root. What evidence can be set against this in favour of a root *αϕ*? Mr Paley in a review of my first edition (*Camb. Univ. Gazette*, Dec. 8, 1869) gives an assumed opinion of Dr Donaldson that *αϕ* and *ϕαϕ* were identical, because the notions of air and light are closely allied. The merely subjective impressions of any one philologist, however ingenious, can hardly weigh much against linguistic facts. Then he calls the root "an instance of onomatopoeia, expressing something that brushes past with a changeful and fitful gleam," and compares "our *whiff*, *waft*, *weft*, *chaff*, *dwos*, *flare*, *stuff*." If all these could be shewn to be derived from *αϕ* or *ϕαϕ*, (which I am very sure is impossible,) I cannot see that a case would be made out for deriving *ἠώς* from *αϕ*, half so probable as that I have given for deriving it from *us*. If it be not from *us*, how is the agreement of those four words to be accounted for?

from another, e.g. that to dwell and to clothe are both modifications of an earlier sense, i.e. to cover; yet it seems to me, as I have already often said, more probable that the roots were originally diverse, and came into their present common form in times which elude our analysis: at any rate they are distinct roots for us, and their derivatives must be kept distinct. This VAS "to clothe" produced numerous Sanskrit words for clothing: it gave the Gothic *vas-ti*, "a vest:" it has the Graeco-Italian form \sqrt{ves} : which produced *ues-tis* and Ἑσθής ; and is hardly distinguishable in ἔν-νυμι , for Ἑσ-νυ-μι , where the σ has been assimilated, or in the Homeric ἑανός (Ἑσ-ανο), where it is totally lost. Curtius¹ connects with the same root the similar word ἑανός , which, as Buttmann has shewn², is regularly used in Homer as the epithet of a garment, and with the penultima long. Buttmann does not suggest any derivation, but wishes (I think justly) to separate the word from ἔννυμι and ἑανός , on the ground of the insufficiency of meaning in such phrases as πέπλος ἑανός , where some more distinctive epithet is to be expected. May the word have meant "woven," and been derived from a simpler form of the root which produced the German *weben*, our "web"? That there must have once been a root without the final consonant (probably vi) seems proved by the Sanskrit \sqrt{ve} , to "weave," and by the Latin *uieo*, to bind, or hoop, together with its derivatives *uitis*, *uimen*, *witta*, &c., and by the A. S. *wiðie*, a band, or willow twig, our "withy." The sense suggested would, I think, suit all the passages in Homer where the word occurs, except that in which it is the epithet of tin; $\text{τεῦξέ δὲ οἱ κνημῖδας ἑανοῦ κασσινέροιο}$ ³; but the word is there commonly translated "flexible," and this secondary sense might fairly be derived from the first.

The pastoral occupations of the Indo-Europeans are shewn, among many other indications, by the perfect identity in the different nations of the name for the sheep.

¹ *Gr. Et.* No. 565.² *Lexil.* 238.³ *Il.* XVIII. 613.

The original *avi* is unchanged in Sanskrit, Lithuanian, and Gothic (for though the actual word does not occur in this last language, it is proved by the derivatives *avethi*, a flock, and *avistr*, a fold). It is the English "ewe." The Graeco-Italian *ovis* has been affected by the differentiation of original *a*, to be described hereafter. Pictet suggests¹ the connection of the name with the root *AV*; which primarily meant to give ear, attention—whence *audio*, and very probably the Doric word *ātras*, which gives name to the twelfth Idyll of Theokritus²—then, in Sanskrit at least, took a secondary sense of protecting: so that *avi* should mean the creature to be attended to, both from its weakness and its value. This of course amounts to no more than a plausible conjecture.

The almost absolute loss of this spirant in Greek would make the identification of words of the same or similar meaning in Greek and Latin impossible but for the help of the cognate languages, especially the Sanskrit. Thus we should scarcely think of identifying *ίός* with *uirus*, did not the Sanskrit *visha* supply the missing link in the chain which leads us back with certainty to the form *visa*, which was in use before the separation of the three peoples, though, as *uirus* shews, not in any sense necessarily worse than an ill-tasting fluid. The Greek *ίός*, the arrow, would seem to be due to the simple root *I*, from comparison with the Sanskrit *i-shu*, which is formed with a different suffix.

VA, to blow, gives in Sk. *vāta*, and Greek *ἄ-Φή-της*, Lith. *vētra*, a storm, wind or storm; it is however commonly nasalised in Europe, as in *ue-n-tus*, in Gothic *vi-n-das*, and our "wind." It is also found in *ἄ-Φη-με* and *ἀντμήν*: perhaps also in *uanus*, though a secondary form is here more probable.

Fick³ connects *ἄρη* with another $\sqrt{Fā}$ and the obscure Sanskrit \sqrt{van} to hurt. The two forms really imply a root

¹ *Origines Ind.-Eur.* i. 357.

² *Gr. Et.* 346.

³ p. 187.

VA. From this comes *āFa-tā*, which is attested by the Lesbian *αῦατα*¹. The simple sense is found in Greek in *οὔταω*, the *a* has been changed to *o* (as in the participle *ἀπούρας*, beside *ἀπαυράω*: the compound word is *ἀπο-φέρ*: and the root is seen in Latin *uer-rere*). The root is found also in Lith. *voṭis* and Gothic *vundas*, our "wound." It explains the *άάατον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ*, where the first *a* is privative, the second prosthetic, and the third radical.

Vira was a man in Indo-European. It is the Sanskrit *vīra* in the same eulogistic sense as *uir*, opposed to *homo*, the *terrae filius*, the Lith. *vīra-s*, the Gothic *vair*², Old Irish *fer* (by a regular change in Keltic of the soft to the hard labial). It was the A. S. *wer*, but is lost with us, except in "wer-wolf."

Vaika was the house, the fixed abode, where a man "entered in" habitually, for the root is *VIK* to enter, the Greek *ῥικ* in *ἰκ-ε-της*. The Sk. *veṇa* seems to have meant no more than the Greek *φοῖκ-ος*, which however has a later form, though the older sense. But *wic-us* has been enlarged to an assemblage of buildings, the Gothic *veihs*, and our "wick." I have already pointed out the absence of any word to denote a town (in anything like the sense of Graeco-Italian times) among the Indo-Europeans.

Lastly, *v* was useful in some formative and case-suffixes. Thus the form *akva*, "a horse," is visible in all the derived languages—hardly perhaps in *ἵππος*, which is yet identical with *akva*, the labial spirant having assimilated the guttural *k* into the labial *p*, which then in turn assimilated the *s*. Similarly the fuller forms *-van* and *-vant* existed in the Indo-European, parallel to *-man* and *-mant*. The second *-vant*—corrupted to *εντ* and *οτ* in the Greek—*χαρι-Feντ*, and *τετυπ-For*: in Latin the change was even more complete, if Schleicher³ is right in tracing the termination *-oso* in *fructuosus*, &c. from *-vant* or rather a

¹ Pind. *Pyth.* II. 52.

² In Gothic *i* and *u* become *ai* and *au* before *r* and *h* by a phonetic variation special to this language.

³ *Comp.* p. 403.

secondary *vant-a*, which became by changes common enough in the Latin *-vonso*, *-onso*, *-oso*.

CH. V.

S. *Liquids*.

Finally, we have to consider the cognate sounds R and L, commonly called liquids. I have already mentioned that there is great doubt whether L be as old as the days of the one common speech. I hold it certain that R in the original speech was the continuous central, not the vibrated or trilled sound. It is only on the supposition that it had a definite position in the mouth that the change into L becomes intelligible. The physiological difference between the two sounds has already been explained: the tongue is in the same direction for each of them, but *r* is central and *l* is lateral. The greater ease of *l* is so much and no more. Historical facts seem to point in the same direction¹. L is much less frequent in Sanskrit than R, the Hindus having retained the R in many cases where in the European languages it has passed into L: thus the root of brightness and whiteness RUK is still \sqrt{ruj} in Sanskrit, but \sqrt{luk} in Graeco-Italian — *λευκός* and *luceo*. Clearly this change would be much less likely if original R had been a trill, capable of being sounded at any part of the mouth: it is much more likely that the original sound was the firm *r*, which could pass into either *l* or the trilled *r*. In Sanskrit, as in English, it went even further than the trill; the mouth passage was so open that the sound was absolutely vocalic: in Sanskrit we get the so-called vowel *ṛi*, in English the glide *r*; the sounds were probably identical. The passage from the stronger *r* is in each case historically traceable. The letter *l* is absent in Zend altogether; and this is a very strong argument in favour of those who hold (as Fick does) that the L was developed by the European peoples (still united) after their separation from the Asiatic family. It is improbable that if L had been the common possession of the entire race, it should have been utterly lost by one important division. On the other hand, it is quite possible

¹ See p. 89.

that the not very numerous roots (to be mentioned below) in which *l* is found in Sanskrit as well as in Europe, agree by accident only. Some at least of the *l*-sounds in Sanskrit must have arisen after the separation; for they are not found in Europe. It is, therefore, not greatly improbable that it arose independently in all cases.

R.

The first and most obvious root with this letter is AR. This root¹ gives the Greek *ἀρώ*, Latin *arare*, Gothic *arjan*, the old English "to ear," and Lithuanian *arti*—all meaning to plough. But this sense though universal in Europe did not belong to the Asiatic languages. In spite of the identity of sound, the Sanskrit *ar-i-tra* does not correspond in meaning to *ἀρ-ο-τρο-*, but to *ἐρ-ετ-μο-*; at least *ἐρετμός* and Latin *re-mus* (for *resmus*) mean the oar, while the Sanskrit noun denotes the rudder, which was no doubt originally only a large oar. It is of course conceivable that in Sanskrit also the root once meant to plough, and then, ceasing to be used in its literal sense, signified only to plough the sea. But here it seems more likely that the two ideas of ploughing and rowing are special applications of the more general idea of propelling. The Greeks and Latins were then enabled by their greater vowel range to distinguish these different ideas by different forms of the original root: the original form \sqrt{ar} was retained to express ploughing: but as original *A* could be split up into *a*, *e*, and *o*, \sqrt{er} was taken to denote rowing. The same kind of differentiation is seen in the Lithuanian, which has *irti* to row, besides *arti* to plough. The vowel appears after *r* in the Latin *ratis*. Such changes, as has been already mentioned, are very possible between vowels and the semivocalic liquids and nasals. They are especially plentiful in England. Thus Old English *brid* is a bird: *bird* is our bride. Anglo-Saxon has

¹ Gr. Et. No. 490.

bred and *bord* for our board. Old English *breſt* is burst, and *bren* is burn; *eorning* is convertible with *renning*, i. e. running¹: our horse, A. S. *hors*, is Norse *hros* and German *ross*. In all such cases the change seems to be between a vibrated *r* and a glide. In *bird* we have a glide; in *brid* a greater vibration than that of the ordinary English *r*. I think we may infer that wherever the metathesis took place, the *r* was vibrated. The third form of the root is to be found in the Graeco-Italian $\sqrt{\text{or}}$ "to be uplifted," in *ὄρῳπα* and *orior*. The identity of this root with the older AR is shewn by its occurrence in Sanskrit—weakened, it is true, in form to the single Sanskrit vowel *ri*: but such tenses as are formed directly from the root come from *ar*: still this slight difference of form served to keep the roots distinct. This root had also the L-form in Latin—*ad-olesco*, *sub-ol-es*, &c.: perhaps also *abolere*, where the sense would be causal, to lift up and cast away.

There are two other roots—identical in their Graeco-Italian form $\sqrt{\text{ver}}$ —"to speak," and "to look warily," which were once VAR, for that form is preserved in each case by the Gothic, though as the second there means hardly more than to tell to beware, or to forbid, it may perhaps not be absolutely distinct from the first; but the difference in meaning in Latin is strong against their identity. Neither of them occurs in Sanskrit; a fact which is not surprising when we consider that $\sqrt{\text{var}}$ —the form under which each must have appeared—is already engaged to express the three ideas of covering, surrounding, and choosing: all of which may possibly have come from one sensuous idea, such as putting the hand on a thing; from which the first and third idea would naturally be derived, and the second may have been

(Necessity of distinguishing between different roots which have the same form.)

¹ Thus we read:

"Biholdes toward hise feet • say fro hem renne;
eornen al of red blod."

Joseph of Arimathie, 274, 5, ed. Skeat.

deduced from the first: but the ideas expressed by \sqrt{ver} , which must in any case have been distinct from those expressed by \sqrt{var} , were unable to maintain themselves under the same form as their stronger rival: the ideas therefore were expressed by other sounds, and these forms failed out of the language. The second root, “to look cautiously,” became in Greek φορ , and therefore so far distinct from the first root: but both roots by the loss of the spirant became undistinguishable from the roots *er* and *or* already mentioned: and no further vowel-change being possible, confusion was inevitable. Thus while we have from \sqrt{ver} to speak, *verbum* in Latin, and *vaurd* in Gothic—our “word”—from the older form \sqrt{var} the Greek can shew us only $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Similarly \sqrt{ver} , to look cautiously, the Latin *vereor*, from the older form of which we get our “ware” and “ward,” in the newer Greek form appears only as $\acute{o}\rho\alpha\nu$, and in several nouns, as $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$, $\acute{o}\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ a “watcher,” and its compounds $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\phi\rho\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and $\phi\rho\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$.

Indeed a curious fatality seems to have brought together for the Greeks as many different ideas as possible under the same sound, *or*. The name for a mountain— $\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ —has no certain congeners in other languages: but the Sanskrit *giri*, and the Slavonic *gora*¹, make it probable that the loss of initial *g*, which though rare yet does occur in Greek, has caused the confusion in form between this word and the derivatives of \sqrt{or} and \sqrt{vor} . Before the *g* entirely passed out of the Greek it probably was changed in one derivative at least by means of a parasitic *v* to β : thus $\beta\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$, the north wind, would be the mountain-wind; and the Hyperboreans, instead of being dwellers beyond the north-wind, would occupy a more conceivable position, “beyond the mountains”—the natural dividers of mankind in early times. Again, $\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ a boundary—the Ionic $\acute{o}\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ —is almost identical in form with $\acute{o}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ a mountain—for the rough breathing is perhaps

¹ Gr. Et. No. 504.

only an Attic mispronunciation; but the derivation of the word is very doubtful: if it be from $\sqrt{\text{ser}}$ to draw—whence $\epsilon\lambda\rho\omega$ and $\sigma\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}$, a rope—in the sense of a line drawn—compare the Latin *ser-ies*, a row, and the Spanish “sierra,” a long ridge—the breathing will then be the regular representative of the lost spirant. Lastly, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, whey, gives us a third identical form; where we know the missing letter to have been *s* from the Latin *serum*: and the similarity of sense and sound leads at once to the Sanskrit *sara*: which is derived by the Indian grammarians from *sṛi* (SAR) to go; a somewhat inappropriate derivation, as Prof. Key has truly pointed out, for a word which denotes, besides whey, a pond and salt ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\varsigma$, *sal* and *salum*); whilst *sarīt*, said to come from the same root, means a river. Probably derivatives from different roots have been here confounded: and whilst *sarīt* may be assigned to SAR, to go, $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and the rest may be better referred to another lost SAR, identical in form, but differing in sense; but what that sense was, we cannot say.

L.

LAS¹ is found in the Sanskrit *las* to embrace and $\sqrt{\text{lash}}$ to desire: in the Doric $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omega$ to wish, where the σ has fallen out: in the common Greek $\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ and $\lambda\iota\text{-}\lambda\alpha\text{-}\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$; probably also in $\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$; in *las-ciūos*; and in Gothic *lustus*, desire, “lust.” In the Bohemian dialect of the Slavonic *laska* is love. In all these the connection of form and idea is sufficiently plain.

Another root with a double form LIBH and LUBH, to desire, appears in Sanskrit under the second form, with the derivative *lobha* covetousness. It is the rare Greek verb $\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, whence $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\iota\mu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\varsigma$ used by Aeschylus²: the Latin has both forms *lubet* and *libet*, the former presumably the older, according to the scale of vowel-strength in that language: in Gothic *liubs* is “lief,” i.e. dear, hence

¹ Gr. Et. No. 532.

² Seven against Thebes, 380.

the Scotch *leesome* (i.e. *lief-some*), pleasant¹: and the common "leeze me," i.e. *lief* is me, meaning, I am fond of a thing: the O. H. G. has *liuban* to love, and that which man loves, *lob*, praise: the Lithuanian and Slavonic present the root under the same form and with the same meaning as the German. *LU*, to cut, is \sqrt{lu} in Sanskrit, where it has produced a large class of derivatives, but all close in meaning. In Greek and Latin we have $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ and *solio*, i.e. *se-lu-o*. In Lithuanian, *liauti* is to end, with which sense Fick² compares $\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota-\mu\alpha\chi\omicron\varsigma$. He also refers $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\nu$ to this root, as that which is cut: so that the transition from the corn to the field³ is easy enough: $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\nu$ also is a sickle. A secondary form in *s* has given in the Teutonic languages the Gothic *lausjan*, Germ. *lösen*, our "loose." In Europe the primary root seems to have taken a derived sense, to cut off for oneself: hence perhaps $\lambda\eta\iota\varsigma$, *λεία*, and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ ⁴: in Latin *lucrum*, and *Lauerna*: Gothic *laun*, A. S. *lôn*, Germ. *lohn*, and our "loan," with a different sense.

In these and some other cases *l* is found universally. It is possible, as I have said above, that the weakening may have taken place in Sanskrit and in the other languages separately. The independent action of the European and Asiatic families in this matter is shewn by the fact that sometimes, though very rarely, Sanskrit has *l* while the other languages have *r*: thus Sanskrit \sqrt{rup} = Latin \sqrt{rup} (in *rumpo*), O. H. G. *raubon*, Gothic *raupjan*, the Scotch "roup," and our "rob."

The onomatopoeia *lala* has distinct meanings in $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$, German *lallen*, and Lith. *lalóti*. This word at least is not changed from *rara*, but mere onomatopoeias cannot be relied upon as arguments for the existence of a letter at any particular date. See under B.

¹ "The tender heart o' leesome luve
The gowd an' siller canna buy."

BURNS, p. 204, Globe ed.

² p. 176.

³ Theok. x. 42.

⁴ Fick, p. 394; but see *Gr. Et.* No. 536.

I have thus given examples of the occurrence of all the certain consonants of the Indo-European alphabet, together with B and L, in roots and words presumably Indo-European. These examples must have already made plain the existence of the three original vowels A, I, U. The vowels E and O have also occurred frequently in European derivatives: sometimes also in Sanskrit words, where however their position is quite different: they are there always long, and are intensified forms of the simple vowels I and U respectively, corresponding to *ai* and *au* in the original language. In the other languages *ě* and *ō* are, as has been already mentioned, weakened forms of A. I shall not here describe these vowel-changes further, and their effect on the different languages, in the way in which I have to some extent described some of the more remarkable consonantal changes in the languages of India and North Europe, because the investigation, if fully carried out, would lead us too far away from our subject. The vowels are the soul of a language: in the laws of their change the principles of growth of the whole language are involved. This will be seen in the examination of the vowel-laws of the Greek and Latin.

I have given these few instances to shew, as I said before, that there was a real Indo-European language, not a mere list of naked roots to which the name Indo-European has been given. They will suffice, together with the list of suffixes given in a previous chapter, to shew that this language had reached the second stage of linguistic progress—that stage in which different relations were no longer expressed, as in the Chinese, by adding to the root a new significant root. For this purpose suffixes were employed, syllables whose original meaning had passed away, which were therefore all the better qualified to meet the logical wants of a people which had attained to a very considerable degree of cultivation.

Any description of the physical and moral development of our ancestors is beyond my present scope; except

so far as any light has been thrown by the above examples on the conditions of place and climate under which they lived, on their domestic life, on their social institutions, and on their conceptions of an unseen world. Full information on all these points is to be obtained from Pictet's elaborate work already referred to, the *Origines Indo-Européennes*: and the English reader may find a brief but excellent sketch in the second chapter of Mommsen's *History of Rome*, which is especially valuable to us, because it not only describes the condition of the collective family, but also estimates the stage of development at which the Graeco-Italian race had arrived at the time when it had parted off from the Northern and Eastern peoples, but had not been broken up into the Hellenes and Italians. Fick¹ also estimates the additional development which he conceives the European family to have attained previous to its disruption. The main additions are the extension of agriculture, a further knowledge of plants and of beasts, the power of working in stone, but no more metals than the original gold, silver and copper, and in general little further knowledge of the arts. His brief summary of the condition of the Indo-European people may be regarded as a revision of Pictet's. It is very readable, and though sometimes inconclusive yet always suggestive. Thus, for example, Fick (following Benfey) considers that the term *patniā*, applied to the wife, indicates "the complete equality of the wife: polygamy and subjection of women is *accordingly* altogether foreign to the Indo-Germans." I certainly hope that this is true, and the term may express all this: but it may also mean no more than the head-wife, or even no more than the especial chattel of the lord and master (*patni*). In *bhrātar* (brother) Fick sees the support and help (\sqrt{bhar} , to carry) due to the sister, especially after the parent's death: and he is very angry at the suggestion, that because *bhartar* (in Sanskrit) means a husband, the marriage of brother and

¹ *Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europas*, pp. 265—292.

sister may have been a primitive custom—a suggestion in which he sees that “Phantom, der Darwinsche Vater der Affen und Menschen:” however, so far as etymology goes, there is no doubt that he is right. In *svasar* (sister) he allows some difficulty: but he is quite sure that it contains the word *sva* “own,” as it probably does: yet I do not see in it any support of his doctrine of the excellent monogamic order maintained in the ancient household: I am afraid that it points more naturally to different families of one father, in each of which the brother may have his “own,” not merely his half-sister. I am, of course, speaking here (as Fick does) of the evidence to be derived from names alone. Where the terms confirm such evidence as can be drawn from the earliest condition of the family traceable in the divided races of men, then their evidence is valuable. And I certainly know no historical traces to be found in Europe of plurality of wives.

NOTE I. ON CHAPTER V.

The simplest form into which Grimm's Law can be put is the following Table, in which A stands for aspirate, s for soft, and H for hard. The word ASH may serve as a *memoria technica* for the whole.

TABLE I.

Ind.-Eur., Greek, Latin.	Low German (Gothic, English, &c.).	Old High German.
A	S	H
S	H	A
H	A	S

The substitutes are given more exactly in the following tables: it will be seen that breaths have taken the place of aspirates everywhere except in Greek.

TABLE II.

Gr.	Lat.	Goth.	O. H. G.	Gr.	Lat.	Goth.	O. H. G.	Gr.	Lat.	Goth.	O. H. G.
χ	h, g	g	k	g		k	ch, h	κ	c, q	h, g	h, g
θ	f, d	d	t	d		t	z, sz		t	th, d	d
φ	f, b	b	p	b		p	f, pf		p	f, b	f, v, b

I now give words containing the *regular* substitutes in each case, where such can be given. I have taken English to represent the Low German: I give the modern High German equivalents. It will be seen how much that language has varied from its ancient form. Initial sounds are taken (with one exception), because they are more regular.

TABLE III.

χγν	hanser	goose	kans (gans)	γένος δός	genus duo	kin	chumni (cf. kind)	καρβία	cord	heart	¹ herza (herz)
βήρ	fera	deer	tior (thier)	ῥός		two	zwei (zwei)	τρίς	tris	three	drei (drei)
φηγός	fagus	beech	puocha (büche)	¹ κάδναβις		hemp	hanf	ποός	pes	foot	² fuoß (fuss)

¹ Ind.-Eur. *b* is not found at the beginning of words. See p. 115.

² No regular substitutes found in these cases.

Exceptions to the law are given very well by Ferrar¹. They are found in a few distinctly onomatopoeitic words; also in words borrowed by one language from another, when the sound of the original language was naturally retained. The exception becomes regular in the initial consonantal groups, *sk*, *st*, *sp*: thus *stella*, *star*, and *stern* (see p. 36), shew the *st* alike: the reason is plain enough; the hard *s* can be pronounced easily with no sound but a hard one. In the same way Helfenstein² explains the occurrence of *t* in *noct- night*, *naht* (*Nacht*), as due to the preservative influence of the preceding *h*. I much doubt this. I believe the preservation of this *t* in all the languages is best explained by the dislike to change again a word which had been changed once, lest all its distinctive features should be lost³: here, I think, *t* was retained because *k* had been already changed. In the same way I explain the correspondence in Gothic of *biuga* to *φεύγω*, *fugio*: the change of the aspirate to the soft at the beginning is regular, but the original *g* is not changed at the end of the root, and I think for the reason which I have given: there are a great many similar instances given by Ferrar⁴, but explained by him as arising from a double aspirate in the root: i. e. he postulates here Ind.-Eur. BHUGH, and apparently thinks the GH was weakened to *g* in Graeco-Italian: this would be highly irregular; and there seems to me no sufficient evidence for his original form; and therefore I much prefer my explanation. But no doubt some apparent exceptions to the law have arisen from weakenings in the different languages after their separation: thus Gothic *faihan*, Germ. *fügen*, correspond to *πήγνυμι*: now we ought to find *κ* in Greek corresponding to *h* and *g* in the other languages: and *√pak* was the original form in Graeco-Italian, as is shewn by *πάσσαλος* and *paciscor*: but it was weakened to *√pay* in Greece. Here it will be observed the Teutonic words have suffered a change of both consonants: the striving for clearness, spoken of above, operates frequently, but by no means regularly.

¹ *Comparative Grammar*, I. 34—38.

² *Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic Languages*, p. 103.

³ See Chapter I. p. 4.

⁴ p. 36.

The reason of these changes has been suggested at page 5 : see also Max Müller¹, with whom I agree as to their character. He seems however to regard the changes of the Gothic and High German to have been simultaneous : at least he says (p. 206) "none was before the other." It seems to me at least as probable that the changes of the Gothic came first in time, and were shared by the whole German race, Low and High alike, before their separation : then after that time the Low German altered no more, but the High German repeated the same change. This appears to me likely from the much slighter character of that change. It will be seen, that in the third division of Table III.—the division which deals with the original hards—in two cases out of three the change was never made at all in High German : and in the first division also in two cases the change, though made, was not permanent : the hards sank back into the softs again. The whole variation accordingly seems to me more like a faint reflex of the first². The main objection to this view is the want of any sufficient motive, as far as we can see, for the second variation. The first variation rose, as all agree, from the objectionable aspirates. These were expressed by the soft in Gothic, and the other changes followed from a desire for clearness. But when they were gone, and the breaths *h*, *th*, *f* only were left, why should the High Germans have made any further change ? I confess, I can give no reply.

In order to explain the change from the softs to the hards, Prof. March (*ib.*) suggests that the Kelts, who "used more surd breath and less sonant than we, adopted the speech of invading Teutons, that their Celtic pronunciation as heard by the Teutons become current ; and that climatic influences and alliteration made the change thorough." The Keltic tendency to aspirate is doubtless an established physical fact, and has been mentioned above (p. 17) : and the variation of English speech, within historical times in Ireland, lends some support to this plausible conjecture ; perhaps all the support it is likely to receive.

A new explanation has been given by Mr Fennell³ : namely,

¹ *Lectures*, II. 206.

² See Prof. March, *Comparative Grammar of Anglo-Saxon*, p. 29.

³ *Attempt*, &c. p. 14.

that the whole dislocation was due to a Teutonic tendency to speak quickly or sharply : when the aspirates were lost the softs were hardened, and the original hards were very hard : and that a further action of the hardening tendency changed the harder of the two softs (the original soft and the descendant of the aspirate) into an "absolute hard" while the effort to utter the very hard representatives of the early hard resulted in failure, and produced spirants. In fact he postulates further gradations of softness or hardness in each class : as he says "the alphabetical signs by no means exhaust the possible gradations of elements of articulate speech." This is undoubtedly true ; notably we have more vowel-sounds than vowel-signs ; and even consonants might have more symbols than most languages possess ; e. g. the palatal sounds are not adequately represented. But my ears do not catch Mr Fennell's minute subdivision of the gutturals : and the absolute hard is as perplexing to me as the Aryan desire for absolute brevity, which Mr Fennell elsewhere (p. 30) regards as one of the causes of phonetic change.

NOTE II. ON CHAPTER V.

I mentioned above that nearly all the nations agree in their term for snow. The examples of agreement in the words denoting cold might be considerably increased. The severity of the Indo-European winter, which is inferred from them, suits well with the country which has been assigned by conjecture to our forefathers ; "central Bactria, the mountainous part extending from the Hindoo Koosh to the plain of the Oxus¹." This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that next to winter the most numerous analogies are to be found in the words for spring. One of the numerous Sanskrit names for spring is *vasanta* ; the first part of this word is found in the Greek *ῥαπ* (for *ῥεσ-απ*), in

¹ Pictet, *Orig. Indo.-Europ.* i. 97.

the Latin *vēr* (for *veser*), the Lithuanian *was-ara* (but meaning "summer"), the Slavonian *ves-na*, and the Scandinavian *vār*. This agreement is too great to be accidental; there can be no doubt that *vasa* or *vasara* was the name which the Indo-Europeans gave to the welcome spring which followed the five months winter of their high mountain home. Its meaning is very doubtful. There are two or three distinct roots of the same form, *vas*, which have been already mentioned; but none gives a satisfactory meaning: the best perhaps is that which means "to clothe;" so that spring should be the re-clothing of Nature: this however may be thought fanciful. But in the names for summer we find hardly any agreement. Each nation had its own name. The Sanskrit *ushma* and Latin *aestas* are both the "burning time," but from different roots: the Greek *θερος* is from a different root again, and implies only warmth. The Irish *sam* or *samh* may be akin to the German *Sommer*, of uncertain derivation; and these therefore have the best claim to having preserved the original term. This want of agreement is probably rightly explained by Pictet: in temperate climates summer is only a continuation of spring, and is less striking to the senses; hence the different peoples replaced the one primitive name—if indeed there were not already more than one in those early days—by distinct appellations of their own, suitable to the climate of their new abodes. Autumn offers us absolutely no analogies; it is not until the latest subdivision of the peoples that we find names for it occurring among these nations who required the term. For some never needed it, as the northern peoples: for them the old division sufficed, which separated distinctly only winter and spring, with summer considered as a continuation of the latter; the German peoples lost the old name for spring, and the Lithuanians, as we have seen, applied it to summer; both therefore parted with the old slight distinction. The Hindus strengthened it, and at an early period subdivided the three seasons, making them six, to suit the Indian climate and periodical rains; while the Greeks and Romans found the want of a name to denote the "later season," but not till they had separated, when the Greeks called it by no more distinctive name, *ὀπ-ώρα*; for practical purposes in their splendid climate finding it sufficient to divide the year

into *θέρος* and *χειμών*; the Roman "auctumnus" was developed on Italian soil.

As Pictet well points out¹ the Indo-European division of the year, besides corresponding well to their supposed country, also harmonizes with what from other sources we know of their employments. With a people mainly pastoral the second natural division of the year is the time of the return of the flocks for winter quarters. And when an agricultural succeeded to a pastoral age, no further distinction was required, because the grain is harvested in summer. A separate term for a fourth season does not become necessary until the time of the cultivation of fruit-trees, especially of the vine.

¹ *Orig.* i. 107.

CHAPTER VI.

DYNAMIC CHANGE.

CH. VI.

*Classes of
change
which were
originally
dynamic
or very old
phonetic
ones.*

I INTEND in this chapter to describe some changes which are connected together by apparent community of use; all of which may have had a different origin from those which are demonstrably the result of phonetic change in the several languages of the Indo-European stock. They may have been from the first Dynamic; that is, consciously intended to express some modification of meaning: one of them—Reduplication—certainly must have been so. The other two—Vowel-Intensification and Nasalisation—may have been dynamic: they may, however, have been only phonetic, and afterwards applied (like the phonetic change of *a* into *a*, *e*, *o* already mentioned) to express with more or less regularity differences of conception. In either case it is well to describe them separately. If they were all dynamic in their origin, it is right to keep the results of the formative principle in language distinct from those changes which are due to the destructive principle. If, on the other hand, some of them were phonetic, they are nevertheless so far removed from, by their antiquity (being, as I have already said, to some extent Indo-European), that it is advisable to keep them distinct from the results of Greek and Latin phonetic laws, which we will afterwards consider. Lastly, they resemble each other so much in their use, that it is hardly possible to treat of one without the others.

I have already briefly sketched the general formative

system of language—the process by which a root grew into a base. That growth is by accretions *from without*, and is always easily distinguishable from the processes of phonetic change. I am now about to describe some of the methods by which a root could be modified *from within*; not how e.g. the root $\pi\iota\theta$ could by adding a formative suffix become $\pi\iota\theta\text{-}\alpha\nu\omicron\text{-}$ and $\pi\iota\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\text{-}$ grow into $\pi\iota\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and $\pi\iota\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$ and $\pi\iota\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\omega$; but how by modification of existing elements $\sqrt{\pi\iota\theta}$ became $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omega$ —a change for which (whatever be its origin) I retain the name of Vowel-intensification (the German *Steigerung*)—; how $\sqrt{\lambda\alpha\theta}$ became $\lambda\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ and \sqrt{fid} became *findo* by Nasalisation; and how $\sqrt{\delta\omicron}$ became $\delta\iota\delta\omega\mu\iota$ by Reduplication. At first sight it might appear as though reduplication must be called an external modification. Undoubtedly a further syllable is added to the word: but absolutely no *new* element is added: $\mu\alpha\rho\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$ (which is for $\mu\alpha\rho\text{-}\mu\alpha\rho\text{-}y\omega$) introduces no new idea to modify the old one; the old one is but expressed twice over, till it gets a new association.

Reduplication,
Vowel-Intensification, and
Nasalisation.

Reduplication.

This is probably the earliest, certainly the most natural, method of expressing greater intensity of feeling. But for this very reason, because it is the earliest, the traces of it in Greek and Latin are smaller than those of the other more refined and subtle methods of producing the same result, which have gradually superseded it. These traces are, as might be expected, most common in words which are obviously immediately onomatopoetic: e.g. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ —*ululo*, &c. And indeed the greater number of examples adduced by Prof. Pott¹ to prove the wide extent of this principle are derived from the Tartaric or

Reduplication the
oldest and
simplest
method.

¹ In his book called *Doppelung als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittel der Sprache*, in which the question is treated in the most thoroughgoing and most unreadable way.

CH. VI.

*Evidence
of this de-
rived from
the lan-
guage of
savages
and of
children*

Oceanic speeches. In the ever-varying languages of savages, based almost entirely on *conscious* onomatopoeia, Reduplication is almost the only method employed to strengthen the expression of an idea. Thousands of examples are given by Pott. So also with children; every one must have observed how naturally they form a language of their own on this principle: with them a watch is not a watch but a tick-tick, a railway engine is not a railway-engine but a puff-puff. No doubt much of this is the traditional language of the nursery: but this is no real objection: it shews at least that a child apprehends ideas most easily under these forms. The first word which a child utters, *mama*, is a proof how natural it is. If it be objected that the barbarous dialects of savages and the semi-articulate lisping of children can supply no arguments for a scientific treatment of language, I do not admit this without modification. To argue on the etymology of particular words in some speech which has for centuries been, comparatively speaking, fixed by being the medium of a literature—to connect these with similar words in savage languages is, I admit, unscientific and dangerous. But surely we may base general principles of language on a numerous array of linguistic facts and methods of constructing words observed in innumerable savage dialects. And if there be any tendency shewn by such observation, it is the tendency to reduplication. Can we doubt that *mama* is the name for mother which comes first to the infant's lips in other lands besides our own? It is the most natural because it is the simplest combination of sounds that the infant can make. The single syllable *ma*, or *da*, or *pa*, or whatever it be, is not language; it is a single sound which is not beyond the power of a brute; but when it is doubled we have a conscious attempt at language. When a child grows up he ceases to use the term *mama*, because mother is the term used in the literary dialect which he is taught; but if he were never taught that dialect he would go on calling his

mother *mama*, just in the manner of savages who have no literary dialect. The child and savage in this respect stand on precisely the same footing; and are just the examples we need to shew us what are likely to be the first steps of any language before it has reached its literary stage.

The fact, that with us English the word *mama* is so often retained side by side with *mother*, may perhaps be explained by the fact that there is perhaps no other modern European people which shews so much tendency to (partly onomatopoeitic) reduplication. Consider not merely the interjectional *ha ha*, *tut tut*, *hoity toity*, but also phrases which in some cases obviously arose from imitation of sound, though others shew, at least at present, no signs of such derivation. For example, *ding dong*, *jingle jangle*, *tittle tattle*, are obviously onomatopoeitic: such derivation is not so clear in *knick-knack*, *slip slop*, *riff raff*, *harumscarum*, *hugger-mugger*, *hurly-burly*, *hotch-potch*, *tag-rag*, *humdrum*, *helter skelter*, and numberless others, which any one can supply for himself. I shall confine myself to examples of reduplication taken from the Greek and Latin: but these which I have given are familiar, and the principle, if proved for one language, is proved for all. It is curious that in nearly all these we have not simple reduplication, that is, we have not the same syllable exactly repeated. This is due, no doubt, to a half-conscious dissimilation: thus we may explain the thin vowel *i* being so commonly used in the reduplicated syllable. Where the difference is consonantal, it is more probable that words originally dissimilar have been made more like for the purpose of the jingle, by the conscious application of the opposite principle of assimilation.

In the Greek and Latin then we may with tolerable certainty trace the process in the imitative names of birds, &c. Thus we have *cuculus*, *turtur*, *ulula*, *upupa*, *ἔποψ*, *τέττιξ*, *κακκαβή*, and many others, where the name

Reduplication, first in imitative words, then generally,

is expressive of the sound produced by the creature: compare also *bulbul*, *tomtom*, &c.: other words express sound in general, as *tintinnabulum*, *murmur*, &c.: then the principle, which was perhaps at first restricted to sound, is applied more generally, e.g. in *πα-σπάλ-η* (already mentioned¹), in *Τάνταλος*, probably reduplicated form of $\sqrt{\tau\alpha\lambda}$ to endure, with change of λ to ν before τ , in *Τάρταρος*, which may be from $\sqrt{\tau\alpha\rho}$ to bore, i.e. the very deep hole: *κάρκαρον*, the Latin *carcer*, is not so clear: *κοσκυλμάτια* and *quisquiliæ* mark contempt by their reduplication, things that are pulled incessantly into pieces: *cincinpus* and the weaker *κίκιννος* are not clear, but may be contemptuous: and I can only point to the reduplication in *furfur*, *paraver*, *cucumis*, &c. *Quisquis* is perhaps more than reduplication; it is, so to speak, the first and last term of a series *quis, quis.....quis*, which in Latin is no longer answered by a corresponding antecedent demonstrative, as it is in Sanskrit².

and alliteration.

Prof. Pott is probably right in thinking that he sees a relic of this principle in that fondness for alliteration which prevailed so much among the early Latin poets, Ennius, Naevius, and Plautus. They conceived that their idea was more fully expressed by repetition of the same syllable or syllables, even though the sense was not clearly and directly intensified, as in the case of reduplication. How curiously they laboured at this process may be well seen in the really remarkable fragment of Naevius, from the *Lycurgus*,

Alis sublime alios saltus illicite ubi
Bipedes volucres lino linquant lumina.

In these two lines the syllable *al* occurs twice, *li* six times, *bi* twice, *es* twice, *in* three times. And yet the alliteration is so cleverly managed by reproducing the same syllable

¹ p. 114.

² E. g. in the following line (Nala 5, 11):

Yam yam hi dadriçe teshâm, tam tam mene Nalam nripam.

Quemquem enim uidit eorum, eum eum credidit (esse) Nalam regem.

generally in different parts of the words, that in a rapid reading we are only conscious of a general harmony of sounds very pleasing to the ear. It is only on close examination we perceive how artificial the process has been. *Summa ars celavit artem*. Commonly however the effect is much more obvious: in Plautus it is exceedingly frequent and generally without much reason; no end seems to be served by it: it has become apparently a mere trick of composition. Lucretius also has much of it, and it harmonizes well with his simple style; e.g. in his description of Sicily, as "*multa munita uirum ui*," or in the line, "*mortalem uitam mors cum immortalis adem*it"—which indeed is rather an instance of an idea wonderfully intensified by reduplication than of alliteration. Even Virgil did not altogether disdain the artifice. In his

Neu patriae ualidas in uiscera uertite uires

a certain strength is no doubt given to the line by the hammer-like beats of the *v* sound. Alliteration is found much more rarely in the Greek poets. Yet a perfect and most effective example may be borrowed from the artificial Alexandrian school in the well-known and exquisitely beautiful lines of the Epitaphium Bionis²:

*αἰαὶ τὰ μαλάχαι μὲν ἐπὰν κατὰ κᾶπον ὄλονται
 ἡδὲ τὰ χλωρὰ σέλινα τό τ' εὐθαλὲς οὐλον ἄνηθον,
 ὕστερον αὖ ζῶντι καὶ εἰς ἔτος ἄλλο φύοντι·
 ἄμμες δ' οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροὶ οἱ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες,
 ὁππότε πρῶτα θάνωμες, ἀνάκοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλα
 εὐδομες εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.*

To begin with the last line: clearly much of its matchless length and strength is derived from the double *ευ*, the double *μα* and the fourfold *ον*. I am speaking of course only of the artificial helps, and not ignoring the power of

¹ III. 867.

² Moschus, III. 101—106,

the simple wording. But a careful examination will shew that much more of the melody of the entire passage is due to artificial aid. First of all the passage—naturally in consequence of the simile—divides itself into two equal parts of three lines each. The leading note of the whole is the syllable *ov* : it occurs in every line but one, eleven times in all. But in the first two lines of each half the syllable *av* occurs—once in the first line, once in the second, once in the fourth, twice in the fifth, but not in either the third or the sixth. In each half the *av* dies out by degrees, making way for the *ov*, which reigns triumphant in the last line of each. Now it is quite true that *a* is an older and stronger vowel than *o* : but in Greek, as we shall hereafter see, *o*, in consequence perhaps of its broader sound, is constantly used as a stronger modification of *a*. Therefore the change from *av* to *ov* in this passage is a rise in the scale of sound, marking, as I believe, the rise in the intensity of the pathos. And as if to point this out more clearly, the poet whilst commencing the first clause with *ai* four times, in the corresponding line of the second clause has written *oi* five times, repeating it again twice at the end of the fifth line, after which we have neither *ai* nor *av* again. Nay, even though this may be fanciful, I cannot help thinking that the writer meant to give the key at the end of the first line, where we have the ascending sound, *av-*, *ov-*, *ov-*, the last not occurring again. Be this as it may, the general principle is, I think, unmistakeable, though it is so subtle that I for one had read the passage many a time before I perceived it¹.

These examples of alliteration are no proof of the use of reduplication as a formative principle, but they shew

¹ Alliteration of the most obvious character occurs to excess in Icelandic. For some curious examples of it in Old English, where it is common enough, see an *Essay on Alliterative Poetry*, by the Rev. W. W. Skeat, originally printed in Vol. III. of Bishop Percy's Folio MS., ed. Hales and Furnivall.

the natural bent of the human mind to intensify an idea by repetition of sound. I now pass on to cases where we find reduplication employed to intensify either the quality or quantity of particular words and roots. Here we might most naturally expect to find it in the formation of the superlative; and such is indeed most common in savage dialects. It is also found, though not as a rule, in Sanskrit, e.g. *alpa* is little, and *alpálpa* is very little. But if it ever existed in Greek and Latin, it had entirely passed away before historic times, when we find the requisite increase of idea expressed by formative suffixes. Yet even in them, as Pott has pointed out, a lingering feeling of the possibility of the process is seen in such words as *τρισμέγιστος*, *τρίδουλος*, and the Latin *triscurria*. Here we have reduplication, or triplication rather, in the spirit if not in the letter. A savage would have said *δουλοδουλοδουλος*. The more cultivated Greek could express the same idea with more dexterity. A further example is to be found in the rather artificial compound used by Callimachus in his very beautiful epitaph on Heracleitus,

Slight traces of the formation of superlatives.

ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν που,
ξείν' Ἀλικαρνασσεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδίη.

A sort of reduplication again may be seen in the very common *οὐδεὶς οὐ*, *nemo non*, &c. These are all superlatives: in all these it is intended to express the strongest affirmation. And though here the reduplication is certainly not of the reason, since one negative drives out the other, yet currency was probably given to the expressions by the fact of their coinciding with the popular love for repetition of the same sound.

Far more important for us, as entering more widely into the building up of the languages, are the traces still to be found in Greek and Latin of the systematic reduplication of primary roots to produce frequentative and desiderative verbs and, more rarely, nouns. In Sanskrit such verbs are regularly formed from every root, by redu-

CH. VI.

Regular
formation
of frequen-
tatives or
intensives.

plication. Thus $\sqrt{\text{budh}}$ in Sanskrit means "to know:" *bo-budh* (or *bo-budh-ya*) denotes "to know frequently," or "to know well" (i.e. is either a frequentative or intensive verb), *bu-bodh-i-sha* is "to desire to know." It will be observed that in two out of these three verbs, suffixes *ya* and *sa* are added, over and above reduplication; it is possible that when they were first so used, they retained their primary sense, whatever that was; and so modified the meaning of the root as well as the reduplication. So much at least is certain, that *ya* distinguished an intensive from the desiderative which ended in *sa*. But it does not appear that *ya* can be connected with any root which would necessarily or even naturally convey the idea of intensification: or that *sa* conveyed to the hearer the idea of wishing apart from these compounds. Therefore it is more likely that when they were first thus employed they were formal suffixes, distinguishing indeed one verb in its use from the other, but not capable in themselves of giving that intensification which the doubled syllable did give. Turning now to Greek and Latin we find—besides such onomatopoeitic verbs as *λαλαγεῖν*, *murmurare*, and many others—intensives or frequentatives, for one signification often runs into the other, thus formed; as *μαρμαίρειν*, "to flash," from $\sqrt{\text{μαρ}}$, originally to rub, and so to smooth down, polish. Similarly *παμφαίνειν* is an intensive of $\sqrt{\text{φαν}}$: the whole root is repeated, and the aspirate changed to the hard, and the dental nasal to the labial nasal according to rule. So also *γαργαρίζειν*, "to gurgle," from $\sqrt{\text{γαρ}}$, "to swallow" (the Latin $\sqrt{\text{vor}}$ for $\sqrt{\text{gvor}}$ in *carni-uoru-s*, *uora-re*, but also *gul-a*, *glu-tire*, &c.); compare the Latin *gurgulio*. Likewise *ποι-πνύ-ω*, "to pant," from $\sqrt{\text{πνυ}}$ "to breathe;" *δειδίσσομαι* from $\sqrt{\text{δι}}$ ¹, "to fear;" *μερμηρίζειν*, and the Latin *me-mor*, *memor-ia*, &c. from a root which in Greek took the forms *μαρ* and *μερ*, and $\sqrt{\text{mor}}$

¹ Or perhaps from a $\sqrt{\text{δφ}}$: compare Sk. *dedvishya* = Ind.-Eur. *dai-dvisya*, which is closely preserved in *δειδίσσομαι*. See Benfey, *die Entstehung des Indo-Germanischen Optativs*, p. 19.

in Latin, but which is to be referred back to an Indo-European SMAR: the Sanskrit alone has retained the s: thus *μερμηρίζειν* is "to be careful," intensified from the simple root which means "to remember."

It will be observed that in many of these examples the reduplicated syllable is strengthened; as in *ποιπνύω*, *δειδίσσομαι*, *μαιμάω*, to pant with eagerness, *κοικύλλω*, *ποιφύσσω*, *παιπάλλω*, *δαιδάλλω*: in the nouns *λαίλαψ*, whirlwind, from *√λαβ*, to seize, *μαιμάκτης*, whence the Attic month *μαιμακτηρίων*, probably in *pro-pul-us*, the tree, from *√spal*¹, and others. In these there is little doubt that the feeling of their origin survived until historic times; that men were conscious in using these words that they were employing intensives, and felt their relation to the simple root. It is not easy to account for the (much rarer) strengthening of the radical syllable: in *ἀκ-ωκ-ή* from *√ακ*, something very sharp, in *ἀγωγός* and *ἀγωγή*, where the reason is not plain: though it is in *ὀπωπή* and *ὀδωδή*; and in the irregular lengthening *ἐδ-ωδ-ή* from *√εδ*, clearly on the analogy of the others. The accent, which in all is on the last syllable, may possibly have something to do with it. But there are others where we find the reduplicated syllable weakened, as in *μερμηρίζειν* and *μέμωρ*; in *κίκιννος*, a curl (compared with the Latin *cincinnus*, whence *Cincinnatus*), in *su-surrus*; in *κέκραξ*, *κεκρύφαλος*, a thick covering, in *τέτανος*, in *βέβαιος*, and *βέβηλος* (each from *βα*, the first that which may be gone upon with physical, the latter with ceremonial impunity), the radical vowel has been allowed to sink to *ε*: in *τιθήνη*, in *τιθός* and *τιθάσος*, tame, all probably from *√θα* to milk; in many Latin verbs, *titillare* (compare Greek *τίλλειν*), *titubare*, &c., the vowel is the weakest of all². In all such words the feeling of their origin was gradually passing out of the minds of men; the emphasis had ceased to be laid on the reduplicated syllable, as it must have been

Frequent loss of the original meaning.

¹ See p. 114.

² See Leo Meyer, i. 417—429.

at first when it was the significant part of the compound; and hence the syllable became weakened. This is a good illustration of the change which passes by degrees over all language; that which was originally formative loses its signification, and becomes only mechanical; the living principle passes out, and deadness comes on. And this brings us to a numerous list of verbs where this deadness is almost perfect: in some the intensive or desiderative force has merely died out; in others the no longer significant form seems to have been used to express a different idea. Such verbs are *μιμέομαι*. (Greek $\sqrt{\mu\epsilon}$, Indo-European MA, "to measure"), which seems originally to have signified "I frequently measure myself," and thus, in a restricted sense, "to measure myself by some one, to copy or imitate;" where the frequentative force is perfectly lost. The Latin *imitor* and *imago* are not improbably blunted forms of *mi-mitor* and *mi-mago*¹, and so formed originally on the same principle from the same root, which is found in *me-tior* and strengthened in *mensa* and *mensura*. As *μιμέομαι* stands by regular phonetic change for *μι-μα-γο-μαι*, it exactly corresponds in form to *bo-bhud-ya*, mentioned above.

In such verbs as *διδάσκω*, *ἀραρίσκω*, &c., the intensive force seems not only to be lost, but a causal sense to have taken its place—unless indeed they are to be explained as desideratives—the terminational *σκω* corresponding to the *sa* of *bubodhisha*, so that *ἀραρίσκω* should mean "I desire something to fit," *διδάσκω*, "I desire some one to think." But it is more likely that these forms should be connected with another very important class of verbs: in the formation of which this same principle of reduplication is employed, but for a more limited object. I mean such verbs as *δίδωμι* and *τίθημι* in Greek. In these verbs it will be observed that reduplication is found only in the present tense and the closely connected imperfect; not in the

¹ See however Corssen, K. B. 252.

future δώσω or the aorist ἔδωκα and ἔδων, whilst the reduplication of the perfect is different in its nature. But in the intensives, which I have instanced above, the reduplication passes through all the tenses, although their occurrence is not frequent. In fact, in them the reduplicated verb is practically a new root; in these others the reduplication is an accident of the present tense. How is this difference to be explained?

Reduplication employed to distinguish protracted from momentary action.

All language must of course be able to distinguish the incomplete from the complete stage of action, the "is doing" from the "is done," the *γίγνεσθαι* from the *εἶναι*. But this distinction is not sufficient to express all our conceptions with sufficient clearness. In describing an incomplete action we require often to express whether the operation is over in a moment or requires time; whether it is momentary or lasting—to distinguish the "I do" from the "I am doing," the *γενέσθαι* from the *γίγνεσθαι*. Thus then we have three stages of action, so to speak: the Momentary, the Continuous, the Completed. And each of these stages ought in a perfectly logical language to have its own three sub-divisions in time, the past, the present, and the future. That is, it should possess nine forms produced by internal modification of the root, with the help of such suffixes as have lost their original signification and have become mere parts of the machinery of grammar; not by periphrases, as in seven out of nine times in the forms by which the English denotes the nine distinct ideas; thus:

	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Future.</i>	<i>Past.</i>
MOMENTARY.	I do.	I shall do.	I did.
CONTINUOUS.	I am doing.	I shall be doing.	I was doing.
COMPLETED.	I have done.	I shall have done.	I had done.

Unfortunately, historical investigation of the development of language shews that in the early stages of growth inflexions, derivatives, and the rest of the stock of grammar, are not formed to meet previously-felt logical needs. The order of the process is just reversed. A language develops numerous inflectional and formative suffixes which are vague and undefined in their meaning. The probable origin of these suffixes has been already discussed at some length: if they were pronominal there can be no doubt of their original vagueness. If they were common roots something must be deducted from the argument. But even if "standing," "going," or "following" were the original meaning of some of these suffixes, these meanings, though more special than mere indications of place, are little fit to express with exactness nice distinctions of thought. It is only later, when the need for more accurate expression is felt in consequence of the development of thought and feeling, that these forms found ready to hand are taken and restricted to the expression of distinct logical categories¹; still not so entirely but that some in every class refuse to be bound by the restriction, and retain their old free but indefinite meaning. An example will make my meaning plain. Take the numerous derivative Greek and Latin verbs in *-sco*. These are commonly called Inceptives; and the majority do denote the beginning of an action. But there are very many, and those apparently very old verbs, in both languages where there is no inceptive meaning to be seen, neither are there any traces that it ever existed. Such verbs are *βόσχω*, *φάσχω*, *θρώσχω* in Greek, *pasco*, *nascor*, &c. in Latin. These are in use quite simple verbs, whatever the origin of the suffix may have been². And it is very possible that this suffix and many others existed, before the need for inceptive

¹ Compare Curtius, *Comp. Philology and Classical Scholarship*, p. 20.

² See the explanation suggested at page 55. Curtius however thinks that a common idea of progress is traceable in all these verbs: see his *Elucidations*, &c., p. 142.

verbs was felt, with a vaguer meaning, which partly for that very reason, partly through lapse of time, is not now certainly discoverable. Such instances force us to believe that the changes of form in language are not to be explained by reference to an arbitrary list of logical ideas; and consequently—to return to our present subject—we shall not expect to find in any language exactly the same number of forms as that of the above-mentioned categories. Most languages possess far fewer: some few (especially the Greek) have more, but these new forms differ for the most part from the old only in being produced by additional tense-suffixes, whereas the old were not, with the exception of the future, which always had *śya*. Such later forms are the first or weak aorist, the weak or active perfect, the first passive future; which express no modification of the radical idea not previously given by the older and simpler forms. The Sanskrit possesses nearly all the forms, and the traces of them which exist in the German language lead us to the belief that they were Indo-European. But the Hindu differs from all other people of the stock. He was not as the Greek or as the Roman. The genius of the Hindu people was contemplative, dreamy, mystical—not logical, as that of the Greek¹. Accordingly the Sanskrit has preserved nearly all the grammatical forms which we find in Greek. But it has

¹ Thus the Hindu could brood over an idea: for example, he could believe firmly in the immortality of the soul at a time when any such idea was put forth by the best of the Greeks with stammering lips. In the Bhagavadgītā, the genius of the Sanskrit language for variety of expression, enormously rich though it be, seems almost insufficient to express the intensity of the poet's belief. "Unborn, unchangeable, eternal, old of days," he cries, "the spirit dies not with the dying body..... Like as a man casts aside vestures worn with age, and takes to himself others new: so casting aside its worn-out bodies, the indwelling spirit enters yet new ones..... Impenetrable is it, unconsumable, not to be wasted by water, not to be parched by wind; enduring, all-pervading, firm, unshaken, eternal; invisible, inconceivable, unchangeable." We shall not find anything like this in Greek: the strength of the belief is all Indian. But it is quite possible that a Greek would have expressed such belief as he possessed more logically: for logic is one of the many gifts for which the world has to thank the Greeks: the logic of the Hindu has never spread beyond India.

preserved them with little trace in common use of that nice distinction which we always find in Greek usage. How then are these distinctions of time and order preserved in the Greek? How did they succeed in distinguishing, by simple modification of a root, the momentary, the protracted, the complete performance of that which the root expressed? Principally by means of Vowel-increase or intensification, of which I will speak immediately. For example, take the Greek root *λιπ*; it denotes "to leave momentarily." By increase of the vowel *ι* to *ει* we get *λειπ*, "to leave during a protracted time." Increase again to *λοιπ*, and we get the completed action. Thus *ἐλοιπον*, the aorist, is = "I left at a particular moment;" *λείπω* = "I am leaving," as a continued action: *λέλοιπα*, "I have left and done with it." It cannot indeed be asserted that this vowel-intensification is thus applied quite regularly in any language: especially in the second step there is extreme irregularity: but certainly very considerable traces of a primitive application of the principle can be found. Nor again is this change the only method by which to express the greater fulness of idea involved in continuous as contrasted with momentary action; or, in grammatical phrase, to strengthen the Present Stem. Reduplication is also used for this end; and so at last we get back to the verbs *δίδωμι* and *τίθημι*.

The root of *δίδωμι* is *δο*, found in *δόσις*, *δοτήρ*, &c. This has been already strengthened to *δω* in the momentary tenses, the mom. fut. *δώσω*, the mom. past, i.e. the aorist, *ἔδων*, for which the fuller form *ἔδωκα* was early substituted; consequently to express the continuous present and past, i.e. the imperfect, we require a new method; which is reduplication, and we get *δίδωμι*, *ἐδίδουν*. There is no momentary present in use in Greek: a momentary action when described is commonly already past, and is therefore naturally expressed by the momentary past: or if it is some deed which is done once for all, it can then be expressed by the completed past. Commonly however

the continuous-present is sufficiently exact for ordinary use: when indeed it is essential to point the momentary character of the action, the momentary past is used¹. There is no permanent future; δώσω being regarded as sufficient to express both instantaneous and continuous action. Similarly there is no perfect future; we must have recourse to the periphrasis δεδωκώς ἔσομαι. In verbs in ω however we find this future in the passive—the future which rejoices in the mysterious title *Paulopost*. Thus λελείφομαι is exactly “I shall have been left.” To form all the tenses of the completed stem reduplication is again employed, distinguished from that of the protracted by the vowel of the new syllable, which is always ε: and so by analogy this method crept into use even for those verbs whose stems were already distinguished by the subtler method of vowel increase, as λε-λοιπ: a fact which shews that the meaning of vowel-intensification must have been fading out of the Greek mind. Owing to the great length of this tense—δε-δω-κα-μι—the termination fell off without any compensatory lengthening of the connecting vowel being felt to be required, as it had been in the present of the protracted stem. One verb however in Attic forms the completed present with long ω, probably from its shortness, ἦκω, “I am come;” and they are common in Doric; thus Theokritus uses δεδύκω, πεφύκω, and many others.

¹ So Eur. *Med.* 272:

σέ τήν σκυθρωπὸν καὶ πόσει θυμουμένην
Μήδειαν εἶπον τῆσδε γῆς ἔξω περᾶν.

Here the momentary character of the order, “this instant I bid,” implies the immediate obedience it is to receive. The common explanation that such tenses express a long-formed purpose in the past is surely out of place in passages like this. The tense is used because it is the nearest to the wanting one which would have exactly expressed the meaning; and distinctions of time are therefore disregarded. So in line 245 of the same play:

ἀνὴρ δ', ἔταν τοῖς ἔνδον ἀχθῆται ξυνών,
ἔξω μολῶν ἔπαυσε καρδίαν ἄσπης.

Here I do not believe that it is the “indefinite frequency” of the action which is expressed, but its momentary character.

CH. VI.

Loss of the
original
object.

Other examples of a present stem strengthened by reduplication are γίγνομαι for γι-γεν-ο-μαι, root γεν (γενή-σονται, ἐγενόμην); μίμνω for μι-μεν-ω, existing beside μένω, mom. pres. from √μεν; πίπτω for πι-πετ-ω, root πετ, Doric aor. ἔπετον from which ἔπεσον is a weakening: κέκλωμαι, μέμβλωμαι, and many others. In Latin we have *si-sto*, reduplicated from √*sta*; *gigno* formed like γίγνομαι from √*gen*, *gi-gen-o*; *sero* is *se-so*, from √*sa* (supine *satum*), an Indo-European root, whence we derive our "sow;" *bibo* from √*pa*, by weakening of *p* to *b*, of which there are other examples found; thus *Boblicola* for *Poplicola*, or as we generally have it with one *p* only weakened, *Publicola*: √*pa* is supported in Latin by *potus*, *poculum*, &c. It will be observed that in most of these Latin verbs the reduplication, instead of confining itself to the present, has passed over the rest of the tense-system. There are examples of this in Greek also. Thus we find διδάσκω, διδάξω (contrast μι-μνή-σκομαι, fut. μνή-σο-μαι with no reduplication), ἐδίδαξα, nay even the perfect δεδίδαχα; where the treble *d* must have been a sore trial to the Greek sense of euphony. These cases might undoubtedly, as I said before, be explained as intensive verbs, which therefore retained the reduplication through all the tenses. But there is, at least now, no intensive force in them, and it is not very likely that they ever were such. I prefer to explain them on the same principle I endeavoured to set forth above: that as time went on, the meaning of the process by which the present stem was strengthened faded out of the consciousness of those who used it. Use, the ultimate court of appeal in all questions of language, did not require in these verbs the distinction between the stronger and weaker form: the stronger superseded the weaker, and the other tenses were formed from it as though it had been the original form.

Vowel-Intensification.

CH. VI.

I give here the double steps in each scale as they are given by Schleicher¹. They have been elaborately traced in Latin by Corssen, more especially in his second edition. Curtius apparently accepts the principle of vowel-increase, but it does not occupy any prominence in his work². The two steps are known in Sanskrit by the names of *Guṇa* "modification" and *Vṛiddhi* "increase:" and these terms have been frequently applied to the parallel changes in Greek: there would be more reason for adopting them if the usage of the changes were more harmonious than it is in the two languages. I will mention the changes found in Sanskrit, the most important as nearest the assumed Indo-European changes: and very briefly those which have been traced in Gothic: I will then describe fully those facts in Greek and Latin on which the principle rests. After doing so, I will state some of the objections to its acceptance in its entirety, and briefly consider other explanations of the facts in question.

Schleicher's doctrine of two steps in each vowel-scale.

Schleicher's scales are as follows:

	Orig. vowels.	First step.	Second step.
<i>A-scale.</i>	<i>a,</i>	$a + a = \hat{a},$	$a + \hat{a} = \hat{\hat{a}},$
<i>I-scale.</i>	<i>i,</i>	$a + i = ai,$	$a + ai = \hat{a}i,$
<i>U-scale.</i>	<i>u,</i>	$a + u = au,$	$a + au = \hat{a}u.$

According to this hypothesis these sounds of the original language were employed by the different peoples of the stock, under different forms according to their different phonetic laws, and with more or less of system and precision according to their different gifts, but with the common object of intensifying the idea expressed by the root so modified.

First, then, Sanskrit remained the closest to the sys-

Most recognisable in

¹ See page 59.

² Prof. Whitney, *Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1873—4, p. 315, says that Curtius withholds his assent from the view which he himself advocates, viz., that the change is due to accent—without accepting Schleicher's. It seems to me that Curtius' language (*Gr. Et.* 51—54) implies at least provisional acceptance of Schleicher's view: see also his *Elucidations*, p. 137.

CH. VI.

Sanskrit;
and most
regularly
employed
there.

tem of the original speech, only varying indeed from it by substituting *é* and *ô* for the first steps of the *i* and *u* scales, respectively: in the *a*-scale it has not attained to any means of distinguishing the first or second steps; indeed the Indian grammarians say that there is no *Guna* of *a*, only *Vṛiddhi*, that is, no first step, only a second one. One of the most important uses of the scales is the formation of nominal bases primary and secondary: thus from *√vid*, "to know," comes by regular ascent the well-known word *Veda*: and the second step (together with the suffix *-ika*, gives us *Vaidika*, "belonging to the *Vedas*," an adjective which (minus its final *a*) is now commonly used by English Sanskritists instead of the commoner "Vedic." A more full, indeed redundant, list of derivatives than the Sanskrit possesses by this method of vowel-intensification with formal suffixes, cannot well be conceived. I have already said that it is in this power of forming bases, both nominal and verbal, and its marvellous facility in combining nominal bases thus formed, that the genius of the Sanskrit is especially manifested, as compared with the classical languages. In conjugation we find it applied to strengthen some verbal bases in those persons whose terminations are technically called weak. Among these are the three persons singular of the présent. Thus from *√i* "to go" is formed *émi*, "I go;" *éshi*, "thou goest;" *éti*, "he goes:" but in the plural, *imás*, "we go." This is exactly analogous to the *εἶμι*, *εἶ*, *εἶσι...ἴμεν*: compare also *δίδωμι* with *δίδομεν*. It will be observed that in Sanskrit the accent accompanies the vowel-change: in the plural, where there is no vowel-change, the accent is upon the suffix. I will return to this point afterwards. Here the Greek is not in accordance with the Sanskrit, for *δίδομεν* and *ἴμεν* throw their accent back in accordance with the common Greek rule: though in many minute respects the accentuation is the same in the two languages. It is of course possible that here also it was originally the same, and that in course of time, as the reason of the variety be-

came forgotten, the distinction in accent passed also out of use.

The accent is still found on the last syllable in *φαμέν* and *έσμέν*, but these two verbs are again discordant with the Sanskrit in having *είμι* and *φημί*; even though the latter has the radical vowel increased in the singular.

Not one-tenth of the Sanskrit verbs belong to the second conjugation, which distinguishes the strong and weak forms. The first class of the first conjugation, which alone comprises more than half of the verbs in the language—probably however the latest in time, like the Greek verbs in *ω*—agrees with the Greek in raising the vowel (of *i* or *u*, but not *a*) one step to form the present stem. Thus from \sqrt{budh} we have *bodh-ā-mi*, by the side of $\sqrt{\piυθ}$, *πεύθομαι*. The vowel-change is found in all persons of the dual and plural as well as the singular: here the late formations of Sanskrit and Greek agree. The first and second increase are found in the formation of the Sanskrit perfect, without regard to the conjugations, in accordance with special euphonic rules which may be found in any Sanskrit Grammar: thus the perfect of *budh* is *bubodha*, where there is no further increase from the present stem *bodh*; compare the Greek $\sqrt{\phiυγ}$, *φεύγω*, *πέφευγα*: but verbs ending in vowels generally exhibit the full scale: thus *drū*, “to run,” present *drav-ā-mi* (for *dro-ā-mi*, by a regular euphonic law), perfect *du-drāv-a* (for *du-drāu-a*). The increase is not maintained in the dual and plural of the Sanskrit perfect any more than in the present of the verbs of the second conjugation: here the Sanskrit and the Greek differ.

The substitutes in Gothic for the different steps of the vowel-scales are as follows. We find in the *i*-scale *i*, *ei*, *ai*, in the *u*-scale *u*, *iu*, *au*. The reason of this variation is that the Gothic has no *ā* to employ in the second step; and therefore substitutes *e* and *i* for *ā* in the first steps. Thus, from \sqrt{stig} , to climb, Indo-European *STIGH*, Greek $\sqrt{\sigmaτιχ}$ (whence *στείχω*, *στοῖχος*), we have present *steiga*; I

Vowel-
scales
in the
Gothic;

CH. VI.

climb, perfect *staig*, I clomb; from *bug*, to bend, or "bow," Indo-European BHUG, to bend (Greek *φύγ*, and Latin *fūg*, to fly, i.e. to bend out of the original course: compare the Greek *τροπή* in the same sense, and *τρόπαιον*¹), we have *biuga*, I bend, and *baug*, I bent. In the *a*-scale the Gothic (like the Greek, as we shall see below) distinguishes the first from the second step by employing *é* for the first—the O. H. G. keeps *â*—and *ô* for the second; thus *lat* (German *lassen*=to "let"), *lēta*, *lai-lôt*. Further information on the vowel-changes in Gothic may be found in Helfenstein's *Comparative Grammar*.

and in
the Lithu-
anian;

Lithuanian, which possesses *e* besides *a* as a radical vowel in the *a*-scale, has *a* for the first step and *ô* for the second, like the Teutonic family. In the *i*-scale it has *ei* or *ë*, the last a modification of *e* produced by sounding *a* immediately after it, and consequently always long². The second step is *ai*, like the Gothic. In the *u*-scale we find first *au* or *û*, which is a long *o* with the same parasitic *a* as above, second *āu*. *Au* and *āu* resemble the Sanskrit in becoming before vowels *av* and *ōv* (Sanskrit *āv*) respectively.

It is not necessary to go further into the different languages. The examples which have been given from the most important (except the Greek and Latin) tend to shew that the power of intensifying ideas in this way is as old as Indo-European times; and we may now pass to trace the principle among the Greeks and Italians³.

in Greek
and Latin.
(i) the
A-scale.
Difficulty
of distin-
guishing
the two
steps.

In the *a*-class an obvious difficulty occurs. How is it possible to distinguish the two steps when *a* + *a* becomes *ā*, and *a* + *ā* has no further symbol to represent it? The effects of this difficulty in the Latin will be obvious when we look at the irregularity of the cases where the *ā* has

¹ *Gr. E.* no. 163.

² See Schleicher, *Comp.* p. 135, or his *Lithuanian Grammar*, where the excessively difficult and numerous vowel-sounds are fully explained.

³ Examples are taken principally from Leo Meyer, i. 131—162, Corssen, i. 348—628, of the 2nd edition, in which this part has been enormously expanded.

been intensified. Thus we have *ācer* from the root *ak*, which is short in *ācies*, &c. ; but *mācer* is still short from *mak*, *mācies* ; the causal of the same root *mācero*¹ is long, but *lācero*, similarly formed, is short : perhaps in the case of *mācero*, the formation of which is denominative rather than causal, the *a* has been lengthened on the analogy of causals like *plāc-are* from *plācere*, which is formed quite regularly on the Sanskrit, and probably Indo-European principle². *Sāgax* stands by *sāgus* and *sāgire*, *pāc-iscor* by *pāc-s* (*pāx*, *pāci-s*), *cāueo* by *cāui*, *plāga* and *πληγή* are Graeco-Italian from *√plag* shewn in *ἐπλάγην* : by *frāgilis* we have *suffrāgium*, by *āgo*, *ambāges*. From these and other examples which could be given it would be impossible to lay down any rule for Latin use in this scale when the *a* has been retained and not weakened to *e*. If we turn to Greek we shall find more clearness. Thus we have from the root *ād* (Indo-European and Sanskrit SVAD, compare Latin *sua(d)vis*), *ādeîn*, *ēāda* ; from *√λακ*, *lākeîn*, *lélāka* ; from *√λαθ*, *ēlāthon*, *lélātha*, in the older (Doric) form and in Doric perfects generally. Thus we see the *ā* restricted regularly to the perfect ; the presents being otherwise strengthened (*άνδάνω*, *λάσκω*, *λανθάνω*, &c.). The long *a*, which sometimes appears in the present of these verbs, e.g. *√κραῖγ*, *κραῖζω*, *κεκραῖγα*, is pho-

¹ Corssen however, i. 395, separates the two words.

² According to Schmidt (*Zur Geschichte des Indo-Germanischen Vocalismus* p. 105) we have here not a mere vowel lengthening but compensation for a lost *n* ; the chief evidence is the *n* found in the Lithuanian *manksztyti*. Other words in which he thinks a long vowel is due to a lost nasal are *uācillo* for which he can point to the Sk. *vankara* and the A. Sax. *wankol* ; *lāterna* for *lanterna* ; the termination *-ico* which he explains as *-inco*, comparing *longinquos*, *propinquos* &c., so that *obliquos* should stand for *oblīquos*, &c. There seems no reason to doubt that many irregularities may be explicable in this way, and not be due to simple lengthening. Yet according to Schmidt's view, some of them may be due to a sort of nasalisation : thus from original *ā + n* he would postulate *ā̃ + n* (i.e. a short nasalised vowel followed by the original nasal : from this, as nasalised vowels are apt to be lengthened, he gets *ā̃ + n* : thence *ā + n*, returning to the pure vowel again : or by another step, the long nasal vowel extrudes the original nasal and gives *ā̃* only, and so *ā* pure and simple. He gives no illustration of this long list of changes occurring in any one language,—but several instances of two consecutive steps occurring in different languages.

Different
methods of
distinguishing
them in
Greek;
especially
the employ-
ment of the
existing
division of
A into α,
ε, υ.

netic, not dynamic; $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega = \kappa\rho\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\omega$. The Ionic η , the weakened form of \bar{a} , is similarly used as the rule for the perfect, not the present; for cases like $\pi\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega$ can generally be explained like $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$: that is, $\pi\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega = \pi\tau\ddot{\alpha}\kappa\text{-}\gamma\text{-}\omega$; compare the compound aor. $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$. There are however exceptions to this rule; thus we find $\pi\acute{\eta}\gamma\text{-}\nu\upsilon\text{-}\mu\iota$, perf. $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\gamma\alpha$, where there is no vowel difference: in other cases, e.g. $\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\gamma\upsilon\mu\iota$, where η is found in the present, we have a further increase in the perfect, as $\epsilon\rho\rho\omega\gamma\alpha$. On the whole then it seems allowable to regard \bar{a} and its dialectic equivalent η as occupying the highest step in the a -scale.

Then how did they represent the first step and keep it distinct from the second? Sometimes, as we have seen, by strengthening the verbal stem in different ways; either by reduplication, as $\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ for $\sigma\iota\text{-}\sigma\tau\alpha\text{-}\mu\iota$, or by nasalisation, as in $\acute{\alpha}(\nu)\delta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\nu\text{-}\omega$, or by suffixes; as in $\lambda\acute{\alpha}(\kappa)\text{-}\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\text{-}\tau\omega$, $\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ for $\phi\alpha\nu\text{-}\gamma\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}\nu\upsilon\text{-}\mu\iota$, &c. But very frequently they employed a vowel-variation ready to hand, one originally phonetic only, but capable of being applied to distinguish different shades of meaning¹; that division of the a sound, so often mentioned, into α , ϵ , \omicron , which will be fully described as soon as we come to phonetic change. Now \omicron is a heavier sound than ϵ ; so that while ϵ is employed for the present stem, the greater intensity of idea

¹ This faculty of language may be well illustrated from Prof. Curtius, note 21 on page 31 of his *Essay on Comp. Philology and Classical Scholarship*. He there says (Engl. trans.): "The distinction between $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\omicron\nu$ was surely at first purely phonic, but it subsequently got to be employed to separate the plural from the dual. And the Sanskrit termination of the first person dual $vah\acute{e}$ is most likely but a variation of the 1st pl. $mah\acute{e}$; and scarcely any one would maintain that in the v there is really a significant mark of the dual relation (cf. $vayam$, plur. = 'we'). Thus too I consider $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ as a by-form of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, one which the phonic tendency alone has brought forward. [See however, p. 163.] There was never any difference between e.g. $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ and $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, although a more refined feeling of the language introduced one between $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ and $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$. This is in some degree also the case with the German 'Ablaut' [i. e. the change of a vowel to another vowel of a different class according to certain laws], more especially in its application to the formation of words. It can be shewn that the change of i , a , and u , in the verb *trinken* was there before, and that it arose from very different reasons than the difference in the meaning of *Trank* and *Trunk*."

implied in the completed action can be expressed by *ο*; as e.g. in *πέρθω*, *πέπορθα*; *στρέφω*, *ἔστροφα*, &c. But this more frequently is the mechanism employed in the formation of nominal bases. Thus by *πέρθ-ω* we have *πόρθ-ο* in *πτολίπορθος*; by *στρέφ-ω*, *στροφ-ή*, and *στροφή-ο-ς*; by *ἔχ-ω*, *ὄχ-ο-ς*, and *ὄχ-ή*, and innumerable others¹. Indeed this may fairly be called the most important of all the methods of forming nouns in the language.

A slight difficulty arises here from the fact that the ascent from *ε* to *ο* is not always (indeed not generally) the entire process in the verb-formations on this method. Besides the perfect stem in *ο* and the present stem in *ε* we commonly find another stem in *α*: thus by *τέτροφα* and *τρέφω* we have *ἔτραφον*; by *ἔστροφα* and *στρέφω*, *ἑστράφην*. Now this stem, as expressing the simple momentary action, ought undoubtedly to be expressed by the weakest vowel; and so we find it in the other vowel-scales; e.g. from *λιπ* we have *ἔ-λιπ-ον*, *λείπ-ω*, *λέλοιπ-α*. Clearly we have this relation; as *τέτροφα* is to *λέλοιπα*, so is *τρέφω* to *λείπω*, and *ἔτραφον* to *ἔλιπον*. But *α* undoubtedly, as a rule, passes into *ε*; and therefore we seem in this particular case to have a weakening and not a strengthening in the first step of the scale, though the second step is an increase of sound above the first. It may be that the "Sprachgefühl" of the Greek was here for once at fault; and that the three separate forms being all to hand, *ε* and *ο* were taken, not unnaturally upon the analogy of the *ει*, *οι*, and *ευ*, *ου*, of the other scales, in order to gain that distinctness, which, as we have seen before, the Greeks prized above all other people². The full scale, *α*, *ε*, *ο*, is found in hardly any case where *ρ* or *λ* does

¹ See the full list in Leo Meyer, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, i. 110, &c.

² This difficulty is ignored by Schleicher in his *Compendium*, p. 62, where, in treating of the different intensifications of *α*, he makes *ε* to *ο* one of the first steps. To me it appears certainly a second step in the verbs mentioned above; and in nouns *ὄχος* stands to *ἔχω* just as *στοίχος* (second step) is to *στείχω* (*στιχ*) and *σπουδή* to *σπεύδω* (*σπυδ*).

CH. VI.

not follow or precede¹. But *a* does not always appear even in such cases, e.g. $\sqrt{\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma}$, $\sqrt{\epsilon\rho\gamma}$, $\sqrt{\lambda\epsilon\gamma}$, &c. The fact, however, that ρ and λ have generally the same power is interesting; and may be one argument to shew that ρ is like λ , a continuous central in Greek—not the vibrated *r* of the Latin.

Traces of
the same
method in
Latin.

The Latin is not without traces of the same change. They are few compared with the abundance of the Greek, but may shew that it inherited the same method as the sister language, without the same power of developing it. Thus we find among the verbs the increase from *ě* to *ō*, in *mōneo*, the causal (compare Sanskrit *mān-ayā-mi*) by *me-min-i* (weakened from *me-měn-i*), *men(t)i*s. If *man-e-o* belong (as has been already suggested) to the same root, we have here an example, I believe the only one in Latin, of the triple form in actual use, but with the distinction practically forgotten. Just like *mōneo* is *nōceo*, the causal of *nēc* (in *nex*, *nēcis*), Indo-European *NAK*. Passing to nouns we have *tōga* from $\sqrt{tēg}$; *prōc-u-s*, “a wooer,” by *prēc-ari*; *sōc-iu-s* by *sēq-ui* and *ad-sec-la*, and others².

Advantage
of the dif-
ferent sym-
bols for
long vowels
in the
Greek.

We have seen above that η has gained a place in several present stems, sometimes on phonetic grounds, in other cases perhaps by analogy. This gave the Greeks an advantage which they were not slow to use. Since $\omega : \eta :: o : \epsilon$, another method of ascent in the α -scale was gained thereby. Thus from the root (F) $\rho\alpha\gamma$, present $\rhoήγ-vv-\mu\iota$, they formed the perfect $\epsilon\rho\rho\omega\gamma\alpha$ —in exact analogy, as has been already observed, with the Gothic *lat*, *lēta*, *lailōt*. This ω makes its way also into noun-forms; thus from $\sqrt{\pi\tau\alpha\kappa}$ ($\piτήσσω$) we get $\piτῶ\kappa-\varsigma$ “the hare” (the by-form $\piτῶσσω$ is perhaps a denominative verb formed from it): so also $\alpha\rho\omega\gamma-\acute{o}\varsigma$ stands by $\alpha\rhoήγ\omega$, “to help” (root $\rho\alpha\kappa$): and it occurs regularly in reduplicated nouns, as $\alpha\gamma-\omega\gamma-\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\alpha\gamma-\omega\gamma-\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa-\omega\kappa-\acute{\eta}$, and

¹ See Westphal, *Gr. Gram.* § 37: and a pamphlet by Mr Fennell *On the A scale in Greek*, where this fact is established independently.

² See Schleicher, p. 87.

(perhaps formed on analogy with these) even $\epsilon\delta\text{-}\omega\delta\text{-}\eta$ from the $\sqrt{\epsilon\delta}$. Sometimes the long vowel \bar{e} seems to be employed in the same way in Latin. Thus we have *frā(n)go*, *frēgi*, *āgo*, *ēgi*, *pāciscor* and *pā(n)go*, *pēgi*: together from *cilium* and *oc-cul-o*, we infer a root KAL to cover (found in *c(a)l-am*), from which we get *cāligo* and *cēlare*. *Sātus* has the vowel short, which is long in *Sāturnus*, and apparently changed to \bar{e} in *semen*. But with respect to the perfects the origin of the \bar{e} is not beyond dispute: it may be due to lost reduplication; whilst the other examples, besides being insufficient, shew no clear trace of method.

Short *e* is raised to long *e*, in Greek rarely, as $\mu\acute{e}\text{-}\mu\eta\lambda\text{-}\alpha$ ($\mu\acute{e}\lambda\omega$), and in such cases as $\tau\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\eta\text{-}\mu\iota$ by the side of $\tau\acute{\iota}\text{-}\theta\epsilon\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu$: but more commonly in Latin, where we find *sēdes* (*sēd-eo*), *tēg-u'la* (*tēg-o*), *lex* (*lēg-is*) and *col-lēg-a* by *lēg-o*, *sērus* by *sēries*; and among verbs *ēd-i* (*ēd-o*). Here the root-vowel was in every case originally \bar{a} , as is shewn by the other languages: but it had changed into \bar{e} in Graeco-Italian times.

Similarly short *o* is lengthened, again in Greek more rarely than in Latin: $\delta\delta\text{-}\omega\delta\alpha$ is lengthened from $\sqrt{o\delta}$; $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ stands by $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha$: and the $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ class of verbs corresponds to the $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$ class. In Latin *uox* (*uōc-is*) stands to *uōc-o* in the same relation as *lex* to *lego*: perhaps however the \bar{o} here may represent \bar{a} : we have *vāk* in Sanskrit. We find this change in the verbs often enough, as *fōdio*, *fōdi*, *mōueo*, *mōui*; but here the same remark must be made as about the \bar{e} : *persōna* is an increase of sound upon *sōn-u-s*, and *sōp-i-o* above *sōp-or*. In these two last cases the *o* comes from original *u*: the Indo-European roots are SVAN and SVAP respectively, but this does not affect the principle of the increase of the *o*. As a general rule it would seem that the Latin language preferred the simpler expedient of a merely quantitative increase of sound (\bar{a} to \bar{a} , \bar{e} to \bar{e} , \bar{o} to \bar{o}): while the subtler genius of the Greek chose rather a qualitative strengthen-

Quantitative increase.

(ii) The *I*-scale.

ing, like that of ϵ to σ^1 . Schmidt would again assume a lost nasal, e.g. *mē(n)tior*, *uē(n)sica*, *scrō(m)fa* (cf. γρόμφας), &c.

We may now pass to the *i*-scale, which may claim the merit of being the most perfect and least corrupted exponent of the scheme, both in Greek and Latin. Thus in Greek we have the already often quoted $\sqrt{\lambda\iota\pi}$, whence *ἔλιπον*, *λείπω*, *λέλοιπα*; and nouns formed at each of the steps, *λείψις*, (at least in compounds,) for original *λειπ-τις*, and *λοιπ-ός*: $\sqrt{\pi\iota\theta}$, *ἔπιθον* and *πιθανός*, *πείθω* the verb, the noun *πειθώ* and *πείσις* in compounds like *πεισίβροτος* applied to the sceptre², *πέποιθα*, but no noun of the second step. Very frequently we do not find all the three stages exhibited in the verb; but there is generally some noun to supply the missing link. Thus from $\sqrt{\sigma\iota\chi}$ we have *ἔστιχον* rarely, but *στίχες* (nom. plural); *στείχω* commonly, but no perfect in *οι*: we have however the noun *στοῖχος*, to shew that the principle of the change was consciously held by the language, even when not fully employed. So from $\sqrt{\iota\kappa}$ "to look," or "seem," we find such

¹ Mr Roby (*Latin Grammar*, Preface, p. xxiii) writes: "I have not followed Schleicher and others in the treatment of Latin vocalisation according to what for brevity I may call Sanskrit principles. This method applied to Latin seems to me to fail both in basis and result. Corssen's elaborate treatment of vowel-intensification in the first volume of his new edition is not more satisfactory: and on this point I can refer to Curtius (*Studien*, i. 2, p. 294), who, commenting on Corssen's sanguine view of the result of his medley collection of long vowels in root-syllables, suffixes and endings, points out that vowel-intensification is after all only a name for the fact that we often meet with a long vowel when we expect a short one." I am not greatly concerned to defend Corssen in this matter: and with Mr Roby's pithy statement of the result of Corssen's work I agree: the cause, however, may be the extreme disorganization of the Latin vocalism, which prevents us from discovering clear traces of method equally clear as those of Greek and Sanskrit: and if it existed in those languages, it must have been inherited by, and operated in, the Latin also, although in a manner which was early obscured, and is now hardly traceable. I may say that Curtius, in the criticism quoted above, seems to me to be referring to one part of Corssen's work only, the "Einlautige Steigerung," not to vowel-intensification in general: and even here specially to one point only, the long *a* in *erām*, *erās*, &c. Corssen compares (inter alia) *ἔ(σ)ησθα*, &c. in Greek: and refers the long vowel to this principle. This explanation is certainly not satisfactory: but I do not know a better. That of Schleicher, that *eram* (for example) = *es-aya-m*, seems to rest on no good analogy.

² *Æsch. Choeph.* 362.

forms as *ἔλκτον*, the dual third person¹; no present *εἶκω* in use, but *εἰκών* "a semblance," or "image:" and the second stage is evidenced by *ἔοικα*. Similarly from $\sqrt{\iota}$ "to go," we have *ἴμεν*, *εἶμι*, and *ὁῖμος*, "a way." $\sqrt{\kappa\iota}$ "to lie," is unrepresented in the simplest form, which is found in the Latin *quies*, but the first step is seen in the so-called perfect, but really present tense *κεῖμαι*, and the second in *κοίτη* and *κοιμάω*. Good Latin examples are hard to find; indeed there is probably no verb which exhibits all the stages, for the Latin verb had no form to denote the completed action, and expressed the perfect merely by reduplicating the simple base of the momentary action: often in later times by the suffixes *-vi* and *-si* for *fui* and *esi*, the perfects of \sqrt{fu} and \sqrt{es} respectively. It is to the nouns that we must look for traces of the second step, disguised of course by the Latin peculiarity of pronunciation, which changed *oi* into *oe*, and that sometimes into *ū*. Thus \sqrt{fid} produces *fides*, *feidus* (in classical Latin *fidus*), and *feido* (*fido*), *foidus* (*foedus*). There is *leiber* whence *liber*, with the second step *loebertas* (Festus), that is *loibertas*. The root *SPAK*, to see, sank in Latin through \sqrt{spec} to *spic*: from this we find in Latin *picus*: the German "specht" shews that the *s* has been lost, as well as in our wood-"pecker:" and that *i* stood for *ei* is most probable from the Umbrian *peicos*. The long *i* in *suspicio* is probably due to the same change. We have the first step in *deico* (*dīco*) from \sqrt{dik} ; from \sqrt{i} , which is short in *īter*, comes *eire* (*īre*, "to go"): and we find in inscriptions also forms like *veivos* (*vīvus*), *leites* (*lites*), *deivos* (*dīvus*), *veicos* (*vīcus*), which is formed from the same root as *φοῖκος*; but while the Latin raises the radical *i* one step, the Greek jumps to the second. The second stage is seen in *moenera* (from *moinera*), which again passed into *mūnera*: and we find in inscriptions such forms as *oinos*, *coiravit*, *oitile*, which appear in classical Latin as *ūnus*, *cūravit*, and *ūtīle*. In none of these cases, it is true, can we point to the radical vowel

¹ *Odyssey* ix. 27.

CH. VI.

occurring in any Latin word, or indeed to the first steps *ei* in each case. We can only fall back on the analogy of *fides*, *fidus* and *foedus*,—coupled with the fact that the corruption in the Latin vowels is of such old date, that we cannot well expect many perfect examples of the principle.

Occurrence
of *ai* as an
intensified
form of *i*.

Not seldom (considering the small number of cases in which this vowel-strengthening is traceable in Latin) *ai* is found as an increase of *i*, by the side of *ei* and *oi*. These, as has been noticed by both Leo Meyer and Schleicher, are generally cases where the radical form had early fallen into disuse; and the intensified form was therefore used without any sense of its relation to the original root, a root which must have ceased to occur at an early period of the Graeco-Italian history, before the application of *ei* and *oi* to denote the first and second steps respectively had become the established rule. Thus we deduce an Indo-European root *IDH*, "to kindle," from the Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{indh}}$, with the same sense (past part. *iddha*, that is *idh* + *ta*, in accordance with a euphonic law of the language). Now no word is found in either Greek or Latin which contains this root in its simple form; but several which contain it raised a step, that is to *aiθ* in Greek and *aed* in Latin. Such are *aiθω*, *aiθος* and *aiθήρ*; *aed-es*¹, *aestus* and *aestas*; in the last two *d* has passed into *s* before *t* by the ordinary Latin rule. We must suppose therefore that at some very early period of the Graeco-Italian nationality the root *idh* was raised to *aidh*, from which came the above-mentioned words; that the simple form of the root then was lost, so entirely that no tenses formed from it occur under the verb *aiθω*, of which only the present and imperfect, that is the present and past continuous, are

¹ Was *aedes* "the place of a fire," taken by the Latins alone to denote a house, because of the fires necessary to counteract the malaria of the plain of Latium? Or was it originally, as in classical times, a temple, from the use of fire in sacrifice? Then it would pass to the general signification of "a building," and the plural "the buildings" be used for the more extensive family house, like *δῶμα* in the Greek tragedians.

found. The principle of the intensification is lost; the formal result alone remains. The increase of sound may be even older than the Graeco-Italian period, for we find from the same root (which however is very barren except in Greek and Latin) the Sanskrit noun *édhas*, "fire-wood," and the O. H. G. *eit*, "fire¹:" in that case the root *idh* may have been lost immediately after the first separation of the Eastern and Western nations.

The Latin has some examples to shew where the original and the intensified base are both preserved: of course *ai* has passed into *ae*. Such are *mis-er* and *maestus*: perhaps also *imitor* and *aem-ulus*: a similar process of formation is claimed for *Scaevus* (*σκαίός*), *laevus* (*λαιός*), and *caecus*² from *SKI*, whence *σκιά* and our "sky" (through the sense of shadow, cloud, cloudy sky—natural in the north). Grimm's law is violated because of the initial *s*. A root *IG*, to shake, occurs as *ing* in Sanskrit: this would give by a natural transition the Latin *aeger*, *aegrotus*, &c.; the Greek *αἰγίς*, whether the shield or the thunderbolt, and *αἰγείρος*, the quivering tree³. *Caedo* may be raised from the same root as *σχίζω*: the original *k* is seen in *σκινδάλαμος*. *Laetus* may shew the same root as Sk. *priya*, dear, perhaps "*φίλος*," Goth. *frijon*, our "friend." Whether *αἰών*, *aeuom*, are formed by the same method from *I* "to go" with suffix *-van*, seems to me doubtful. Quantitative increase in this scale is found to some extent in both languages, but more in the Latin. Thus from \sqrt{kli} (*ἐ-κλίθην*) we have *κλίτυς* and *κλίυος*, *κλῖνω* and *de-clīno*; *φθῖνω* is regular in Homer (though not in Attic, like many similar verbs): but *φθίσιμβροτος* is curious in a base of that sort which nearly always follows the radical quantity: \sqrt{kri} gives *κρίνω*, *crīmen*, &c.; \sqrt{vi} gives *uītis*, *uīmen*, and probably also *uīnum*, the name for the climbing tree first, then the produce of its fruit. Schmidt's chief examples of a lost nasal are *ob-li(n)quos*, mentioned above,

¹ See Schleicher, Curtius, *Gr. Et.* p. 225.

² p. 91..

³ Corss. I. 376.

CH. VI.

(iii) The
U-scale.

(cf. λίξ and λίγξ, given by Hesychius, and Lith. *lenkti*); *flī(n)go*, Gothic *bliggvan*, &c.

Perfect examples of intensification in the *u*-scale are more difficult to find, even in Greek. We have from √έλυθ ἤλυθον, ἐλεύ(θ)σομαι and εἰλήλουθα, where both steps occur. We have from √φυγ ἔφυγον and φεύγω, but the perfect is only πέφευγα; nor does the higher form seem to occur in any noun. So also from √συ was formed σεύω, and from √χυ χεύω, where the *υ* however passed into the digamma, which was lost in common Greek, and χέω remained: but we still have χεύσω in the future. Similarly from √ξυ is ξέω. From √ρυ and √πνυ we have, beside ῥέω and πνέω, ῥεῦμα and πνεῦμα as first steps, then ῥοή (for ροϜη that is ῥου + η), πνοή (πνοϜη, πνου + ή) for second steps: similarly ξόανον from √ξυ. The two steps are found without any radical form occurring in σπεῦδα, σπουδή: it is probable however from the identity of meaning that the simple form is found in the Latin *stud-ium*, and there are examples of the transition from *τ* to *π*. So also we find ἀκόλουθος beside κέλευθος, where the simple form is very uncertain¹. From √lug, seen in Latin *lug-u-bris*, *lug-eo*, we have λυγρός, and λευγαλέος, but λουγός, not λουγός: and by a similarly irregular variation λουμός may be connected with √λυ.

In classical Latin all distinction between the two steps is lost, because both *eu* and *ou* passed into *ū*. From √flu we find *fle(u)-o*, where the *u* afterwards dropped out, as was natural between two vowels; though it might equally well, and perhaps at first did, take the vowel sound: from the same root we have *flou-ius*, a river, and *flūmen*, where the step is uncertain. There is the same uncertainty about *nutus* from NU; we have *ev* in νεύω. According to Corssen the *u* has very frequently fallen out after *o*; e.g. in *po(u)ena*, from PU, to cleanse, in *pūtus* and the nominal verb *pūtō*, to clear, physically, a vine, and mentally, any subject thought over, (*putare rationes*, to 'clear one's

¹ See Benfey, *Gr. Wurz. Lexicon*, II. 319.

accounts, is transitional between the two); and the long *u* in *pūrus* and *pūnio* is doubtless from a similar *oe*, a diphthong which however itself more commonly arises from *oi*. Similarly from *MU* we have *mo(u)erus* or *mūrus*. Corssen has recovered from inscriptions old proper names, such as *Teurisci*, *Leucesie* (apparently from *LUK*, whence *λευκός*), and the Greeks transliterated *Lucius* into *Λεύκιος*, which however may be only on analogy. *Ou* is found more frequently in the inscriptions, as *Loucina*, *Loucania*, *iours* (for *ius*, *iuris*), *ioudex*, &c. For *duco* we find *douco*, where we should rather have expected *deuco* as the first step: perhaps *ou* superseded in this and other places an original *eu*, by the assimilating force of the *u* upon the *e*¹.

Just as in the *i*-scale we found an archaic increase to *ai*, so also we find *au* in the *u*-scale: a good instance is seen in *αὔξανω* and *augeo*, the simplest form of which, *UG*, is preserved in *ύγ-ι-ής* and Sanskrit *ug-ra*, "powerful." The sense "to increase" was probably the original one²; but while the simple form in Greek and Latin was restricted to bodily growth and health, the strengthened form retained the wider sense, and the connection between the two was lost. *Navis*, *ναῦς*, may come from a root *nu* (Schleicher) or *snu* (Curtius); the original *s* however must have been lost in all the languages. The Latin *Aurora* was originally *Aus-osa*, a strengthened form from *US*, "to burn," already mentioned. *SKU*, to cover, is seen in *σκεῦ-ος*, and in *κεύ-θω* with the loss of the *s*, and perhaps with *av* in *κανσία*: *s* has also fallen off in *cau-os*, *cau-ea*, *caulae*, &c., all apparently from the same root. From *LU* to wash (as in *λύ-ερε*, and *λύθρον*), we have *lau-tus* (but in Greek *λού-ειν*): from *RU*, seen in *ῥάβ-ω*, we have *raucus*: from *PU* to strike (Greek *πα(F)-ίω*) we have *pau-ire* and *pau-imentum*: from the other *PU* mentioned above we have *pa-eni-tet*, as well as *po-ena*: there seems to be even a third root of the same form, expressing rottenness, in *pū-tris*, *pa-edor*, and *pū-s*, *pū-tere*: it is the German *faul*, our

*U intensi-
fied to au.*

¹ Schleicher, p. 93.

² *Gr. Et.* No. 159.

"foul," in the old sense of crumbling, decayed, which it retains in Cumberland, e.g. Foulsyke: apparently also Foulmire, for foul mere, not far from Cambridge. The derivatives of KUP, to trade, are numerous, the simple form may be found in *cup-io*, and is in *caup-o* and *cop-a*, where the change from *au* to *o* is regular: but a comparison of *κάπ-ηλος* would seem to shew that the original form was KAP: and this is confirmed by the Teutonic: in O. H. G. we have *chauf-an*, and also *kouf-ōn*, the modern *kaufen*: in Danish we have *Copenhagen*: the variations in English of this root are well known; the names "Chapman," "Copeman," and probably "Cooper;" the market places, "Cheapside," "Chepstow" (contrast Stow-market), "Chipping" Norton; and the verbs to *chaffer* and to *chop* (of horses, or of the wind)¹.

There is the same quantitative increase of U as of I; that is, we often find *ū* both in Greek and Latin, without being able to say it is a contraction of *au*, *eu*, or *ou*. Thus we have *φύσις* but *φύλον*, *κῆτος*, but *σκῆτος*, from SKU mentioned above: from DHU we have *θύος* but *θυμός*, and in Latin *fūmus* and *fūnus*: we have *rüber* and *rūfus*, *Rūpilius* and *rūpes*, *pronūba* and *nūbo*.

I have thus given examples to support the doctrine that these vowel-changes were consciously made first by the Indo-European people to express some modification of idea: that this principle was received from them and employed in the same way by their descendants. We have seen that both in Sanskrit and in Greek verbs traces of a common purpose exist: and these are supported by the changes of the Gothic: thus in the perfect by the side of *οἶδα*, *οἶσθα*, *οἶδε*, *ἴσμεν*, *ἴστε*, *ἴσασι* we find in Gothic, *vait*, *vaist*, *vait*, *vit-u-m*, *vit-u-th*, *vit-u-n*: and the originals from which we get these surprisingly analogous forms, and the parallel ones in Sanskrit, were probably *vivaid(m)a*, *vivaid-tā*, *vivaid(a)*, *vividmasi*, *vividtasi*, *vividanti*². It is an obvi-

¹ See Isaac Taylor, *Words and Places*, p. 394.

² Schleicher, *Comp.* § 291.

ous objection to the doctrine that the intensified vowel here denotes the completed, as distinguished from the incomplete action, that the change in its oldest application is found only in the singular: and the extraordinary agreement of the three languages in this respect makes it clear that this was no late and accidental variation: the difference between the singular and plural is certainly Indo-European and was faithfully preserved by the derived languages. Yet it will hardly be maintained by any one that the change of vowel is due to any conception of the singular as distinct from the plural. It seems to be connected with the difference of the length of the terminations. Was then the vowel change of the singular merely compensatory for the weakening of the suffixes¹? Or was the vowel intensified in the singular to express the completed action of the perfect, but not in the plural because the length of the termination made any further strengthening of the word distasteful? and was the strengthening of the present stem similarly intended to denote continuous action? It would not be easy to say which alternative is most probable. In favour however of the latter it may be added that we should be justified in believing in *some* intentional strengthening by the parallel use of reduplication², which was certainly at first consciously employed.

¹ This is practically Prof. Benfey's doctrine, which he connects with the accent. He lays down that the accent naturally falls on the modifying syllable of the word—a difficult postulate: thus in *i-más* "we go," the strong termination, *mas*, modifies and restricts the general idea of going to the particular going of some persons more than two, and spoken of by themselves: hence it is accented. But when certain terminations became weakened, e.g. *mi* from *ma*, they were unable longer to bear the accent, which then fell back either on the radical syllable, and strengthened it, as *ēmi*, or some other modifying element, if such existed, as *dādāmi* (in the plural *dadmás*), or a formative suffix (as *nu*): thus from *√chi* we get *chī-nó-mi* but *chī-nū-más* (compare except for the accent *δεκ-νῦ-μ*, but *δεκ-νῦ-μεν*). By the accent here is apparently meant stress or force, and not raising of tone.

² To this argument which I urged in my second edition, Prof. Whitney has replied briefly (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* p. 309). He says in the first place that reduplication is an external change not an internal one: and that it "involves a coarse and palpable symbolism." I quite admit that it is a ruder method of change, but most nations do proceed from

But a conscious double change in the primary language has against it the irregularities of Greek and Latin (so far as the history of the latter can be traced)—such, I mean, as *πέφενγα*, in the perfect and *douco* in the present: and there are parallel irregularities in the Sanskrit. The agreement of the Gothic in shewing two steps is important, but the difference of the vowel systems of the Teutonic languages renders it inconclusive. I think therefore that such appearances as we have of a second step are probably special developments of the different languages after the separation. At least they can hardly be proved to be more.

If we turn from vowel-increase in verbs to its use in the formation of nominal bases, we shall not find any common purpose traceable. In Sanskrit nominal bases are formed in great numbers and with great regularity, like *vid*, *veda*, *vaidika*, mentioned above. Sometimes the suffix only is added, with no vowel change; these however are the exceptions to the rule: sometimes there is vowel change, but no further suffix, as in *paurusha*, manly, from *purusha* a man, *Bauddha*, a Buddhist, from *Buddha*. In Greek there are many traces of principle, but nowise in harmony with the Sanskrit. In the formation of nouns *οι* is regularly preferred, as in *αοιδή* and *αοιδός*, *αμοιβή*, *κοιτή*, *λοιβή*, *στοιβή*, &c., *οἶμος*, *οἶνος*, *οἶτος*, *οἶκτος*, *λοιμός* (?); and even

rude to more polished mechanisms: and if it be external it is assuredly essentially different from the "collocation, agglutination and integration" which he says (p. 304) have been the exclusive means by which language has been formed: it is not the putting together of two distinct ideas, but the intensifying of one: to say *gam-gam* as the expression of a vigorous going, is quite different from such collocation as e.g. *moon-shine*: in the one case we express a single idea, in the other, two: as is further shewn by the fact that the complete repetition of the whole root had to some extent ceased to be felt necessary even in the original language. Secondly, Professor Whitney argues that the office of reduplication in the verbal structure is strictly definable. Surely it is just as definable as that of vowel change and no more. Each method is found to form the present stem, each is found to form the perfect (though no doubt reduplication soon became a special accompaniment of the perfect): in Greek, causals are formed among other ways by reduplication as *διδάσκω*, *ἵστημι*, *ἔημι*: in Latin (among others) by vowel change with a suffix, as *doceo*, *monéo*, *noceo*. Each is used with much original vagueness as a formative method, and each therefore naturally came to be used with much irregularity.

in cases where the other languages shew the first step; as in *οἶκος*, Lat. *ueicos*, Sk. *veṇa*, Goth. *veihsa*, in *λοιγός*, Sk. *ruj* and *rujā*, in *ποικίλος*, Sk. *peṇala*, &c. The diphthong *ει* is rarer: we have *εἶδος*, *τεῖχος* (but also *τοῖχος*), *ὄνειδος*, perhaps *νείκος*, &c.: it will be observed that these are all formed by the suffix *es* (*as*), while the others had a suffix ending in a vowel. In the other scale *ευ* is very much commoner than *ου*; for which however a fair explanation may lie in the fact that *ου* so early became a single sound (*ū*), and may therefore have been felt to be unsuited for this purpose. We find *πνεῦμα*, *ῥεῦμα*, *χεῦμα*, *σκεῦος*, *ζεύγος*, *νεῦρον*, *ψεῦδος*, *γλεύκος*, *λευκός*, &c., *ῥέος* (Sk. *srava*) but also *ῥόος*, just as *χόος*, the second vowel having passed into the *u*-sound, and then been dropped: in most of these cases the formations in the other languages do not agree; compared with *ζεύγος* we find only modifications of *yug* and *yung*: *sku* (whence *σκεῦος*) is not intensified in Sanskrit: *snāna* (*νεῦρον*) shews the second step. Not unfrequently the Greek shews no change or only lengthening of the vowel, where the other languages have vowel-change: e.g. *νίφα* and *νιφετός*, Gothic *snaiws*; *κλι-* and *κλῖ-*, Gothic *hlaiw*; *λίψ*, &c., Gothic *liuban*; *σίω* (in *κασσίω*), Gothic *siujan*, &c. Cases of complete agreement in three or even two languages are not very numerous, and may be accidental: e.g. Sk. *hemanta*, Greek *χειμών*, Lith. *žẽma*: there is perfect agreement in form between *στεῖχω*, *στοῖχος*, and Gothic *steiga*, *staiga*; but *στοῖχος* and *staiga* differ in meaning: and no argument can really be based on such coincidences as *λείχω*, Sk. *lehmi*, *ἐπ-εῖγω*, Sk. *ejāmi*, *πλέ(F)ω*, Sk. *plave*, or of such isolated words as *-σκοος* (in *θυοσκοός*), Gothic *-skaus*, or *οἶνός* (one), Gothic *ains*. These facts of the Greek language point to a separate and independent development in the formation of nouns of a principle of vowel-variation common to Greek and other languages. Next, in the *i*-scale, *ει* and *οι* were consciously employed to form different classes of nouns: in the *u*-scale the same might have been expected but for the phonetic change of *ou*.

But these different classes of nouns stand in no fixed relation of meaning to each other, as Sanskrit classes do : it cannot for a moment be maintained that *τοιχος*, for example, conveys any more intense meaning than *τειχος*. No sufficient evidence can be derived from Latin because of the transition of the diphthongs to single vowels already mentioned : and in the Greek we see nothing but a distinction of sounds which may have arisen phonetically, applied to distinguish but not to intensify. Further, the fact must not be overlooked that the distinction is in part due to the suffix, as well as to the vowel-change. Prof. Whitney says truly¹ “ a suffix is an element which without having independent use or significance yet distinctly impresses a modification of meaning on the root or theme to which it is appended. And if we allow real value to suffixes when they are used alone, why shall we deny it to them when they are joined with internal change ? ” And this is generally the case : *τειχος* (base *τειχ-ες*) and *τοιχος* (base *τοιχ-ο*) differ in suffix as well as in vowel : so do *ῥεῦμα*, *ῥέ(φ)ος*, *ῥοφή*, *ῥόφος*. On the other hand, when modification of the radical vowel is found as well as a suffix, it is equally reasonable to credit that modification with some power in producing the change of meaning : because it has that power in Sanskrit in cases where there is no new suffix at all².

From this consideration of the uses of vowel-change, we conclude that for the verbs there is some evidence of a conscious intensification of the idea in Indo-European, but not of a double increase : for the nouns there is no sufficient evidence of it ; though the Greeks did extend the splitting of *a* into *a*, *e*, *o* into both noun and verb formations for the purpose of distinction, and though in the Sanskrit there is evidence of a second change, possibly dynamic. The question next arises : could this change in Indo-European be

¹ *l.c.* p. 302.

² Prof. Whitney seems implicitly to deny this ; which would surely be an error : though it may arise from the fact that he is arguing against my opposite error of ignoring the work of the suffix.

*Possibility
that even
the first
step was
originally
phonetic.*

phonetic, not dynamic, in its origin, whatever was its later application? if so, we are not justified in inferring its dynamic origin from its use. Now the possibility of the change of *i* into *ai* and *u* into *au* being phonetic is sufficiently shewn by the changes of English and German. I quote from a paper by Mr Brandreth on vowel-intensification: "*pri-de* (Anglo-Saxon *pryta*)—a word of two syllables in the fourteenth century, and with the *i* sounded as long *i* in French—has become *pride* [that is, sounded as *ai*] in modern English; *science*, which had the accent on the last syllable in Chaucer, is now *science*; *desir*, which used to be pronounced as in French, is now *desire*, with the *e* weakened to the short *i*-sound, and without any of the stress which was formerly laid on the first syllable¹." The same thing is true of monosyllabic words in which therefore the cause of change cannot be variation of stress from one syllable to another. Thus "*ī* and *ū* (pronounced *ee* and *oo*) of the Anglo-Saxon have been regularly and generally increased or gunated to *ai* and *au*—as in *mine* from A. S. *mīn*, *house* from A. S. *hūs*: so generally indeed that we call the *ai* sound 'long *i*'²." I formerly imagined that this change of sound was primarily due to change of spelling: but I am now inclined to follow Mr Ellis, whose argument seems conclusive. He says: "As the sound (*ū*) had been represented by the letters *ou* in those cases where it changed into (*ou*), whereas when (*ū*) was a change of (*ō*) it did not further change into (*ou*), and the orthography also did not give *ou*,—the mere accident of the spelling naturally presents itself as a cause. This hypothesis is strengthened by observing that in the north of England, where reading was perhaps less common than in the south, the sound of (*ū*) in these words still remains unaltered. But such a supposition can hardly be correct, because the change of (*ū*) into (*ou*) is precisely analogous to the change of (*ī*) into (*ei*), a change which must certainly

¹ *Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1873, 4, p. 279.

² *White ey*, *l.c.* p. 310.

have occurred in the passing from the Anglo-Saxon period to the sixteenth century, although it had no connection with the orthography. In each case the change simply consists in commencing the vowel with a sound which is too open (that is with the tongue not sufficiently raised) and, as it were, correcting that error in the course of utterance. This variety of speech might easily be generated and become fashionable in one part of the country and not in another, and as it penetrated far beyond the classes whom orthography could affect at a time when books were rare, and readers rarer in proportion to the speakers, the physiological hypothesis seems more deserving of adoption than the orthographical¹. Of course it cannot be proved from a phonetic change in modern Teutonic dialects² that the same change took place in prehistoric times: all we get is a proof of the possibility of such a change. And it may be further urged, first, that such a change is more than a mere local peculiarity: it rests upon a fundamental fact, I think, in phonetics; that long vowel sounds are specially liable to change because of the length of time during which the voice has to be sustained, and the vocal organs kept in a particular position. Secondly, as I have said before, *ī* and *ū* can hardly be proved to have existed in Indo-European: and yet it seems impossible that these sounds should not have been heard in syllables upon which, for some reason or other, additional stress was laid. It would be in accordance with this fact to regard *ai* and *au* as representatives of *ī* and *ū*, which eventually supplanted the long vowels: though it is possible that they may sometimes have arisen directly from *ī* and *ū*, with no intermediate *ī* and *ū*, through the stress falling on them,

¹ *Early English Pronunciation*, Vol. 1. p. 233.

² The pure *ī* is still found, corresponding to the Gothic *ī* in Danish and Swedish, but it is sounded as in "time" in English and Swabian, and as in "aye" in Dutch, High-German, Frankish, East-Frankish and Bavarian: *ū* is still heard corresponding to Gothic *ū* in Danish, but is sounded as in "house" in English and Swabian, and as German "haus" in High-German, Frankish, East-Frankish, and Bavarian, and with further variations in Dutch and Swedish. Ellis, *l.c.* p. 234.

and causing unintentional alteration of the vocal tube¹. In the first case we have *ai* and *au* produced phonetically from *ī* and *ū*; and the lengthening of these vowels may have been originally dynamic, but need not have been so, since it may have arisen through compensation or some other more unconscious variation: in the second case we have a change which is phonetic throughout: in either case the final change is phonetic, but it may afterwards have been used dynamically: but of that, though there is some evidence, there is no sufficient proof.

The explanation of these varieties as due to accent (urged by Prof. Whitney in the paper already referred to) rests chiefly on the Sanskrit verb-system. This view is put very clearly by him: he says, in the classes of the first conjugation² "in the tenses which have a constant accent, the first, as *bódhāmi*, with increment of the root has also the accent upon it: while the sixth, as *viçāmi*, with unaltered root has the accent upon the class-sign. And in those conjugations in which the accent shifts from root to ending, the root almost uniformly loses the increment when it loses the accent: thus we have *émi* and *imás*, *juhómi*, and *juhumás*, *tanómi* and *tanumás*. In the imperfect of these verbs, which is to be regarded as derived from the present by the prefixion of the augment, although now the augment uniformly receives the accent, we are with evident plausibility to ascribe the difference of vowel to the same original cause: *ájuhos* and *ájuhuta* go back for explanation to *á' juhósi* and *á' juhuthá*. And once more, the like change in the perfect has no other cause; we have there *véda* and *vidmá*, *bubódhá* and *bubudhimá*, as we have *védmi* and *vidmás* in the present³." The chief exceptions to this uniformity are verbs of the fourth class (I conj.), as *náhyāmi*, where the accent is on the first syllable, which yet has no vowel-increment: and the tenth class, as *cho-
ráyāmi*, where the accent is not on the root-vowel, and yet

*These
changes
sometimes
attributed
to accent.*

¹ Brandreth, *l.c.* p. 280.

² See page 191.

³ *l.c.* p. 311.

CH. VI.

that vowel has the increment. I do not press Curtius' objection that this explanation has no right to the name till we are further told why then the accent falls sometimes on the root, sometimes on the class-sign, and sometimes on the personal suffix. We may allow the probability of a single original principle, even though it be subsequently obscured in many cases; such as Benfey's mentioned above¹: or if that principle be thought objectionable, we may extend our faith to the acquiescence in some principle, without attempting to say what that principle was. So far as the verbs are concerned some connection in Sanskrit between increment and accent is probable in spite of all exceptions: though it may be doubted which is the cause and which is the effect². For the nouns Prof. Whitney allows great irregularity; because "the original accentual conditions in this part of grammar" have been much broken up: a statement which affords no proof that such conditions actually existed. This virtual surrender of the nouns seems to be an "abandonment of half the field." Still I grant that the evidence in favour of this theory is sufficient to secure it as much favour as the other, were there no other drawback. But accent is not a term on the meaning of which scholars are agreed: on the contrary, the disputes as to its nature and effects are well known. Perhaps all are agreed in considering it stress of some kind. But there are different sorts of stress in speaking: and these different kinds may be combined on the same syllable, so that it is by no means easy to say whether the same effect is always due to the same cause or causes. Till some general understanding has been reached as to the different elements which constitute stress, and how they may be expected to act separately as well as combined, it seems hopeless to make accent the basis of linguistic theories; because it is shewn by daily experience that two persons

*Vagueness
of the term
"accent."*

¹ See page 205, note 1.

² It seems to me quite as natural that pitch should be dependent on stress as vowel-increment (one result of stress) upon pitch. I say this on the assumption that the accentual marks denoted pitch; see next page.

discussing the same theory do not use their terms in the same sense. The first attempt (so far as I know) to investigate thoroughly the different constituents of stress or emphasis is that of Mr Ellis¹: and he speaks very doubtfully on many points; so that it is far from probable that scholars will soon reach any common ground of agreement. Mr Ellis distinguishes four constituents of emphasis, "length, pitch, force, and form, with their successions and glides"²: these constituents can be, and are combined in different ways in different languages; in each language they are either "free," i.e. variable at the will of the speaker, or "fixed" by national use; thus in ancient Greece "length" and "pitch" (i.e. raising of the tone as denoted by the accentual marks) were definitely fixed for each word: but "force" was free, so that special emphasis was necessarily given by that constituent: it seems to me that in verse force must have coincided with the ictus or rhythmic beat: but Mr Ellis does not hold even this to be necessary. Probably in each language some of these elements have coincided, but in varying combinations, each of which is loosely called accent. These combinations are not necessarily constant for the same country. In Greece (and probably in Italy) force seems to have now superseded pitch: so that the stress is not materially different from that in English: and seemingly by that stress vowels originally short, i.e. λόγος, are lengthened in modern Greek. But there is no indication that the "accent" in ancient Greek had any such effect: vowels were lengthened by ictus, as ἀθάνατος, ἀπονέεσθαι in Homer; but this is in despite of the constituent, whatever it was, which the accentual marks denote: I follow Prof. Hadley in believing it to have been pitch³: and there seems good reason for believing the same

¹ *Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1873, 4, pp. 113—165.

² See also Prof. Blackie's Essay, on *Accent in Language*, reprinted in his *Horæ Hellenicæ*: he recognises nearly the same elements as Mr Ellis, but regards certain combinations of them as almost necessary.

³ See his able paper on this subject in his collected Essays. He maintains that the Graeco-Italian people disliked a cadence in which

of Sanskrit. In Sanskrit there is the further difficulty that the accentual marks are used for the Vedic hymns only: there seems no evidence that e.g. the dramas were ever read according to these marks: at present, I believe, they are read by a native with a force accent, not consistent with the marks. The enunciation of those hymns may have been as artificial as a modern actor's, and had as little relation to every-day speech. These are obscure questions: but until these and many other similar points are definitely settled (if they ever can be settled) we are in danger of confusion, by arguing as though accent was the same thing in all languages, and might be expected to produce everywhere the like result. Prof. Whitney does not define in his paper what he means by accent: in attacking Corssen's statement that vowel-increment and accent [i.e. pitch] need not be necessarily connected, he does so on the ground that it is "contrary to the general analogies of language that the striving after emphasis should produce in the same word two separate results—the stress of voice, or elevation of tone, in one syllable and the vowel-increment in another." It is not quite clear here whether he regards stress of voice (? shewn in force or length) as corresponding in one language to elevation of tone in another; or whether he regards the two as commonly coincident. I think that he generally means a force- or stress-accent: most of his argu-

the high and middle tone were followed by more than one low tone: (by the middle tone he means that fall which is heard in the last half of a circumflex, and as he thinks always on the syllable following an acute:) they were unwilling to have a word ending with a succession of low tones, which (as in English) tend to obscure the concluding syllables. Next, the Greeks after their separation from the Italians preferred that this final low tone should be a short one; consequently they developed a concluding cadence, consisting of high tone, middle tone, short low tone—except in words where the high tone originally fell on the last syllable (as *ἀγαθός*) or the last but one (*γενέσθαι*); in Aeolic even these exceptions were generally not maintained. The Latins when left to themselves developed a different restriction from the Greek one: they would not allow a low tone to be preceded by a middle tone, which occupied the whole of a long syllable; so that their cadence became regularly high tone short, middle tone, low tone: and to secure this cadence they submitted to much more monotony than the Greeks.

mentation is pointless otherwise: but if so, what becomes of his arguments from Sanskrit and Greek, if these were pitch-accents? At all events Corssen's statement is surely borne out by the Greek: where in one word, e.g. *ποικιλόφρων*, we may find vowel-increment in one syllable, elevation of tone in another, and length in a third: and the ictus in verse may coincide with any one of these.

I think then that the origin of vowel-increment must remain for the present an open question.

Nasalisation.

The connection of this phenomenon with vowel-increase consists in the analogy of its use: as *πιθ* is to *πειθ*, so apparently is *fid* to *find*. If it could be proved that the nasal in this position was not originally a distinct sound, but that the symbol denoted only nasalisation of the preceding vowel, we should have a strong argument in favour of the dynamic origin of each change from the analogous use of two closely allied variations of the root-vowel. It will be remembered that a nasalised vowel (such as French *on*) is produced with the mouth in the position for the simple vowel, by diverting some of the breath behind the *velum pendulum*, and so through the nostrils; there is no real consonant sounded; this therefore might seem to be a vowel-modification parallel to the increment, and to be naturally used for the same purpose. There is some little evidence of the existence of nasalised vowels in at least two of the cognate languages. We have the Sanskrit *anusvāra* (after-sound), which was produced according to the grammarians solely through the nose, while each of the five nasals was produced by the nose and the proper mouth-organs: the absence of the mention of any mouth-organ for the *anusvāra* points to an open position of the mouth; and the result of such a position must have been a nasalised vowel. Also the Latin *n* before *s* seems to indicate a nasalised vowel rather than an independent

Nasalisation
seemingly
analogous
to vowel-
increase:
especially
if it arose
from a na-
salised
vowel.

CH. VI.

nasal: thus for example we find *cesor* and *cosol* written for *ensor* and *consul* in old Latin; and Schmidt is right in maintaining¹ that if a genuine *n* had really fallen out of such words, no power on earth could have replaced it at a much later period. The variation between the two forms of writing is probably due to the fact that the Latin had no symbol to represent the sound; and so sometimes *en* was written, sometimes *e*, the real sound lying between the two; in the literary period *n* was regularly introduced, either as the nearest representative of the sound, or because the nasalised vowel had actually resolved itself into the vowel followed by a nasal. Evidence in the same direction is supplied by the representation of some Greek words in Latin, e.g. *thensaurus*, *Scaptensula*, *Megalensia*, &c.: it is nowise likely that a pure *n* was ever sounded in these words, but the preceding vowel may well have been nasalised: the "naturally long" vowel of *īsanus*, *īnfelix* (but *īndoctus*), attested by Cicero², may be explained on the same hypothesis. The evidence of the Latin, however, cannot be called conclusive; and if it were more so, the common possession by Sanskrit and Latin of nasalised vowels would still be but presumptive evidence of their existence in the primitive speech.

If we think it more probable that the nasal in verbs like *findo* was an independent sound, we may still regard it as a parallel usage to the vowel-increment³. But we shall hardly be able to help feeling doubtful whether after all it was not primarily a verbal suffix, which afterwards in certain cases slipped inside the root. This view derives much support from the phenomena of Sanskrit and Greek. Thus in Sanskrit in verbs of the seventh class *n* occurs before the final consonant of the root in the present, dual, and

¹ *Vokalismus*, p. 99.

² *Orat.* 159.

³ So Curtius writes (*Elucidations*, &c. p. 137, trans.): "I cannot see that there is anything absurd in the supposition that the nasal which we find in the *ν-ῥηελκυστικόν* falling upon short vowels at the end of words, should be introduced into the middle of words to produce a greater fullness of tone, like the extension of vowels which is accepted by every one."

If the nasal was from the first an independent so und, it seems possible that it arose from a misplaced suffix.

plural, but *na* in the singular; so from \sqrt{bhid} we get *bhi-ná-d-mi* and *bhi-n-d-más*: here, if the different position of the accent has anything to do with the difference of form, it is more credible that the stress on *-mas* weakened an original *na* to *n*, than that the stress falling on the root-syllable changed original *n* to *na*: and parallel to *na* in this class we find in the fifth class *no* in the singular and *nu* in the plural (*chi-nó-mi*, *chi-nu-más*): and in the ninth class *nā* in the singular, *nī* and *n* in the plural (*yu-nā-mi*, *yu-nī-más*, *yu-n-ánti*). These facts point to different verbal suffixes, which in a few cases have been misplaced, rather than to simple nasalisation. Parallel to these are some well-known Greek verbs. Though in Latin from \sqrt{skid} we get *scindo*, in Greek we have *σκίδνημι* and *σκεδ-άν-νυ-μι*: so that in the Latin form we may have only the remnant of a suffix *na* or *nu* which has been misplaced. The question is difficult: if we decide for nasalisation, we must probably separate the verbs of the fifth and ninth class (as truly formed by suffixes) from those of the seventh, in which alone can we plausibly maintain the hypothesis of nasal strengthening of the root: in Greek we must conclude that from the endeavour to avoid the massing of consonantal sound the *n* in *σκινδ* was passed on; that *σκινδ-μι* became *σκίδ-να-μι*, the new vowel being essential to sound the *n*, if indeed it did not exist as a connecting vowel before the transposition.

I think that upon the evidence of the verbs we should be more inclined to the other hypothesis—that the *n* arose from a suffix, which became misplaced in the Latin: and a middle step may perhaps be seen in verbs like *λαμβάνω*, *θιγγάνω*, &c., in Greek: here the nasal of the radical syllable may have arisen from a hasty pronunciation, in which the nasal of the suffix is anticipated—a phenomenon not unknown in language: or, as Schmidt thinks, it may mark only a nasalising of the root-vowel in an original *λαβ-α-νω*, or *λαβ-νω*; but this nasal vowel must surely have passed into a vowel followed by an independent nasal: and when

Probability of this view as shewn by the verbs.

this nasal had become fully established, the parent-nasal of the suffix ought to have been dropped: as it was in Latin: but in these few verbs both nasals were retained¹; or perhaps after λαβ-νω had become λαμβ-ω, the want of the suffix became apparent and distasteful, and so it was added on again: the latter is the more probable solution.

It is true that in Sanskrit and Greek the nasal is found principally in the present tense, and those immediately connected with the present: the same thing is true of those roots which take vowel-increment: and this harmony seems to bring the two sets of phenomena under the same head. There are some traces of the same rule having been once observed in Latin: thus we have *frango* but *fregi*, *fractum*; compare ῥήγνυμι, ῥήξω, ῥηκτός: then the nasalised stem began to supersede the simple one, partly as in *pungo*, *pupugi*, *punctum*, wholly in *iungo*, *iunxi*, *iunctum*. This argument however loses its force from its being applicable to other verbs, which have their present stem alone formed by undoubted suffixes, e.g. γα, as καίω (for καF-γο-μι); where the future is καύσω (for καF-σω) and the second aorist ἐκά(F)ην, with no trace of the suffix; or σκο, as βόσκω and ρασκο, where the suffix is confined to the present. The nasal however is also found occasionally in the perfect stem, where no formative suffix is ever found: e.g. in πέπονθα from √παθ, κέκλαγγα from √κλαγ: these seem quite analogous to πέποιθα and κέκευθα. But on the whole I do not think that the verbs lend much support to the theory that nasalisation is parallel to vowel-increment, and that each has a dynamic origin.

The nouns
cannot be
so ex-
plained.

Some nouns contain a nasal which point in a different direction to the verbs: thus we find στρόμβος apparently from √στραφ, and θάμβος from √ταφ, and others which seem to be analogous to λειψις, λοιβή and other cases of

¹ It is true that for λαμβάνω there is some reason for assuming a double root, *lab* and *lamb*; cf. Ionic future λάμψομαι and the Sanskrit verb ā-lamb. But the other verbs remain.

vowel-increment. It is at least certain that here the nasal is not due to a suffix: *στρόμβος* is not for *στροβ-νο-ς*, or *θάμβος* for *ταφ-νος*. In some cases we find nasalised and simple nouns side by side; as *πάθος*, *πένθος*; *βάθος*, *βίθος* and *βένθος*; with some different shade of meaning. These may be merely phonetic varieties, and as such they are explained by Curtius¹. Schmidt thinks that in such cases the nasalised form is the oldest: that the *n* was dropped, generally with lengthening of the previous vowel, some traces of which remain; thus between *βένθος* and *βάθος* is Doric *βᾶσσα*, Attic *βῆσσα*²: between *παχύς* and *pinguis* (for which he would postulate a Graeco-Italian nasal form) are *πηγός*, *πηξαι*: he compares the old accusatives *τόνυς*, *τάνυς* (found in Cretan), which passed through *τώς* (*τούς*) *τᾶς*, to *τός*, *τᾶς* in Doric. Generally whenever a long vowel in one language corresponds to a short vowel followed by a nasal in another (e.g. Greek *προμηθεύς*, Sanskrit *pramanthas*), he holds that the nasalised form is the oldest: in this he is probably right. But I do not think that he will find many followers in his explanation of vowel-increment as a resolution of an original nasal: so that for example *indh* is the original form from which come Sanskrit *indhē* and Greek *αἶθω*; or *skind* the original of *scindo* and Gothic *skaida*. As a rule Schmidt allows far too little weight to the formative power exercised in the different languages after the separation: starting from the certain fact that the Indo-Europeans possessed not mere lists of roots but genuine words, he seeks to find these words in modified forms in the derived languages: whilst other investigators are content to believe that new formations from a common root have sprung up separately and frequently ousted the originally common word.

It will be seen that the phenomena of nasalisation are not clear enough to lend us much aid in discovering the cause of vowel-increment. Where the analogy of use is

*Ambiguity
of the evi-
dence.*

¹ *Essay*, &c. note 21.

² This argument, however, requires an original Greek *βανθος*.

CH. VI.

greatest, there is the greatest appearance of the nasal having made its way into the root phonetically from the following syllable, not of its having been a dynamic strengthening. In the nouns its origin is very obscure: and the possibility of its having been developed out of a nasalised vowel must not be altogether rejected. If either set of changes—vowel-increase or nasalisation—could be proved to have been originally dynamic, we should be justified in assuming the same origin for the other. But since we cannot make out a clear case for either, we cannot help regarding with doubt the doctrine that they had an originally common purpose,

CHAPTER VII.

VOWEL-CHANGE.

WE have now cleared the way for the discussion of the nature and extent of phonetic variation in Greek and Latin—such change of sound as was caused in those languages purely by the desire for easier articulation, and was not intended to denote any modification of idea, though the new forms may in some few cases have been afterwards so employed. Two different sets of phenomena resulted from this striving for ease of sound. Either a new sound was substituted for the old more difficult sound; in which case we have the result of *Weak¹ Articulation*: or in consequence of a lazy, perhaps sometimes drawling pronunciation, an entirely new sound became heard in connection with an old one—a sound to which I have already applied the expressive term of Prof. Curtius, “parasitic:” such cases will be considered separately under the head of *Indistinct Articulation*.

Again, Weak Articulation may be viewed under four different aspects. In all the tendency is the same; but the results are different from the modifying effect of neighbouring sounds in certain cases. Sometimes there seems to be no such cause; here we have cases of pure weakening—the substitution of a weaker for a stronger

¹ By the term *weak* I do not intend to imply any weakness in the character of the speaker. I mean that the organs are put into a position in which less exertion is called forth than the old sound requires: and therefore a new sound is the result. This may fairly be called weak articulation, whether the speaker be a lazy man who desires to save his trouble, or a busy man who desires to save his time, or an excitable man whose muscles are not under his own control, or a clumsy man (Fennell, *Attempt*, p. 31) who fails in timing the muscular motions properly. In each case the organs are not put into the position they ought to be in, but into an easier one.

CH. VII.

Phonetic change due to two causes—Weak Articulation, and Indistinct Articulation.

Weak Articulation to be first considered under four heads.

CH. VII.

1. *Substitution.*

sound; for no obvious reason but the inability of the people to pronounce the old one, as in the case of the Greek spirants. Such weakenings are generally very old: the sound thus affected is found in a weakened form throughout the whole language, not merely in dialects of it. Sometimes, on the other hand, we find thoroughly capricious affections of particular sounds which generally remain unaffected, as for example when *a* in Greek is weakened to *ι*—a rare change, but not peculiar to any one dialect—or to *υ*, which is almost confined to Aeolic. But neither in the regular, nor yet in these last irregular “sporadic changes (I adopt another term of Prof. Curtius), is there any visible effect produced by adjoining sounds: and this class of changes, the motive for which lies in the sound itself, will be considered first under the head of *Substitution*.

2. *Loss.*

When this substitution has gone to the utmost length and the sound has perished altogether; or where there has been no substitution, but a too difficult combination of sounds has been accidentally produced and one consequently has fallen out; or where a particular sound was either difficult, or disagreeable to the feeling of the language, to produce at the end of a word—the part which is always more exposed to phonetic influences than any other; under these circumstances we have our second head—*Loss*.

So far the tendency of the change has been all in one direction. We have had not only an easier sound produced by it, but also a weaker sound. The course of phonetic degradation has been down the list of sounds arranged in order of strength, as far as such arrangement is possible: and though the scale may vary in particular details for different languages—for example, the vowel-scale is not quite the same in Greek and in Latin—yet it remains constant for each language. We now come to a different cause of change—the influence of neighbouring sounds. Here the operation of the main principle is no

longer uniform. It is true that the change always produces an easier sound: but it is a matter of indifference whether that easier sound is brought about by weakening a strong to correspond with an adjacent weak letter, as ποσσί from ποδ-σι, or by strengthening a weak sound for a similar reason, as τέττα-ρες from τετ-~~τα~~-ρες. The change indeed is almost always from a stronger to a weaker letter, except in cases of inflection or formation, such as λέλεκ-ται or λεκ-τός, from √λεγ; the difference of ease between pronouncing a hard and a soft letter is of little moment; and the importance of keeping the suffix uncorrupted turned the scale both in Greek and Latin; therefore λεγ-τος did not become λεγδος, as might have been expected. But in all such apparent exceptions the great principle of phonetic change was kept in the spirit, though not in the letter. These variations are, as a rule, later than those mentioned under the first two heads: they are often historically traceable. They are also not so universal; not so essential a part of the character of the language as a whole. Rather they are among the distinguishing marks of dialects. No doubt "euphonic changes," as they are called in grammars, such as δόγμα and λεκτός, *fractus* and *segmentum* (from √sec), are found universally enough. But where the principle has acted to its fullest extent; where two sounds have not merely drawn nearer to each other, but have become identical; we commonly find its action limited to one or two dialects. Thus τέτταρες or τέσσαρες is Attic, but τέτορες is Doric, and πίσυρες old Ionic: κτένω is Aeolic for κτεν-γω, but is not found in any other dialect. In all such cases we have to do merely with a growing tendency, spreading indeed more and more over the whole language, but acting most irregularly, attacking a combination of sounds in one word but leaving it in another, even in the mouth of the same speaker; yet still acting more frequently in one district than another, and so tending to produce a "dialect"—the title we give to the result of a bundle of

CH. VII.

tendencies often contradictory, and rarely fully developed, which is yet sufficiently distinct from other results similarly produced to require a separate name¹.

3. *Assimilation.*

Neighbouring sounds then affect each other, and in two distinct ways. First, when two dissimilar sounds meet, and it is difficult to pronounce both clearly, one assimilates the other—more or less perfectly—to itself: and so we get our third head—*Assimilation*.

4. *Dissimilation.*

Secondly, when two similar sounds occur close together, and when a considerable effort is required to place the organs of speech twice consecutively in the same or a similar position, the opposite result to the last is produced;—which gives us our fourth head—*Dissimilation*.

I shall consider the operation of these four tendencies on Greek and Latin together. I do so, partly because the relative strength and weakness of the two languages will be seen better in this way than if I treated them separately; but my principal reason is this: I hope in this way to make more evident the *reason* of the changes which I have to enumerate: to throw some light on the general principles of language, not merely give a list of the changes found in two. For these principles are universal principles: they act on every language, not least upon our own: and they will be best understood by observing their action

¹ Prof. Ernst Curtius, in his *History of Greece* (Vol. i. p. 27, Eng. trans.), says that Aeolic is not a dialect like the Doric and Ionic, on the ground that it varies in the different regions in which it is found, and has no universally prevalent type. I do not understand this distinction. Do the Aeolic of Asia and the Aeolic of Boeotia differ more than the Doric of Crete and the Doric of Syracuse? No doubt, if we regard a dialect as the result of homogeneous tendencies, we shall find many things contradictory in the Aeolic, which cannot be reduced to any "fixed law of sounds." But this is true of every dialect. Every dialect is sometimes strong, sometimes weak, even in the same class of formations, in consequence of the incomplete action of the tendencies which produced it. If these tendencies had been fully developed, it would have been no more a dialect, but a distinct language. In truth, instead of restricting the Greek dialects to two, it would be wiser to extend their number. Doric includes at least two very marked varieties, Aeolic three: of these, the Doric of Sparta differs not very much from the Aeolic of Boeotia: so that it would not be unscientific to speak of five distinct dialects, without taking into account the varieties of the Ionic. At any rate Aeolic has as good a claim to be a generic title as Doric. See page 30.

in as wide a field as possible. I shall be obliged indeed to consider vowel-change and consonantal change separately, each under the four forms I have mentioned, because the attempt to combine them would practically create confusion.

The following are the general results to which our investigation will lead us with respect to Greek and Latin. We shall find the first tendency—that which leads to substitution—felt considerably in both languages; it affects the Latin vowels much more than those of the Greek; the consonants about equally; but not quite the same consonants in the two languages. The second is rarely felt in Greek whether among vowels or consonants, and is always more or less reducible to rule: whereas it is constant and highly irregular in its operation on the Latin. The third and fourth are utterly powerless over the strong Greek vowel-system: whilst they affect the Latin vowels more than those of any other Indo-European language: on the other hand, the Greek consonants have suffered more from assimilation than the Latin. If we regard the change of hard consonants into soft ones in both languages as due to the effect of the adjoining vowels¹, the results of substitution (as given below) are of course so far reduced, and those of assimilation proportionately increased.

The history of the symbols employed in the Greek and Latin alphabets cannot be given at any length; indeed it does not properly belong to my subject: but a very brief account may be given, because we shall find in each language some symbols which do not denote Indo-European sounds. The Greek symbols so far as τ are Hebrew or Phœnician²: the Phœnician forms are

The symbols of the Greek and Latin alphabets.

¹ See page 83.

² The *sounds* of course were not borrowed with the symbols: these were Indo-European, and had probably been represented before by different symbols. The new ones came into use doubtless in commercial intercourse. For a fuller history of the Greek Alphabet see Kirchhoff's *Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Alphabets*. Prof. Key's treatise on the Alphabet though old is not yet superseded. For the general history of Alphabets the student may be referred to Lenormant's yet unfinished

CH. VII.

The Greek
vowel-
symbols.

commonly the older: and in general the Greek forms correspond best to them, but not always. The peculiar Semitic faucals, called in Hebrew Aleph, He, and Ayin, were not wanted in the Greek, and the symbols were used for the vowels *a*, *ε*, *ο*, as both their position in the alphabet and their shape prove: *ayin* indeed differs considerably from *ο*, but the Phœnician character agrees with it¹. The *iod*, which was not needed for the lost *y*, became *ιωτα*: but there were sufficient traces in Greece of the *w*-sound to require the services of *van*, i.e. *Ϝ*: there was therefore no symbol left to denote *u*: a new one was accordingly added at the end of the alphabet, which, as Prof. Key has pointed out, agrees well enough with the Hebrew form of *ayin*, as distinct from the Phœnician: but it cannot be traced.

The sym-
bols Η and
Ω.

The symbol *H* (the Hebrew guttural *cheth*) was used at first by the Greeks to denote their own spirant *h*, the history of which was very different, until the use of a symbol was no longer felt to be necessary. It was probably called *Heta*, afterwards *Eta*. It was used with fair regularity in the old alphabet of Thera (about Ol. 40) to denote long *e*, though sometimes it retained its old value as *h*: the form being sometimes our *H*, but sometimes with the top and bottom closed, *Ξ*. The notion that the symbols *H* and *Ω* date from 403 B.C.—the year of their introduction into Athens—is obviously erroneous. In the Greek alphabets of Italy, and some of those of the mainland, especially in the Peloponnesian, the first symbol continued to represent *h*. The history of *Omega* is uncertain: the two symbols *ω* and *Ω* seem rather distinct: the former is probably only *οο*, joined together; compare our *w* or “double u.” *Ω* stands not for *omega* but *omicron* in inscriptions of Paros, Siphnos and Thasos: and in all those of the Ægean

Essai sur le propagation de l'Alphabet Phénicien, a work of extreme interest. Some little study of the subject is desirable, if only to guard beginners against the common confusion of the sound with the symbol, and the consequent notion that when one is changed the other is necessarily changed also.

¹ See Key, p. 30.

islands *O* is used for *omega*: Ω is regularly used for *omega* on the coasts of Asia *only* (and not there on the old inscription of Teos, at Colophon or at Rhodes, wherein *O* occurs for both *omicron* and *omega*). Ω does not occur in the alphabets of Greece proper. These facts are at least not opposed to the theory that η and ω had a different quality from ϵ and o .

The non-Phœnician symbols Φ and X are found with little variation of form (\textcircled{P} and $\textcircled{+}$) in old alphabets: though in the oldest which we possess \textcircled{P} and \textcircled{K} appear. But for *chi* there is an important difference of symbol: in the alphabets of Eubœa, Phocis, Locri Ozolæ, Laconia, Arcadia, Elis, and the colonies in Italy, the symbol in use for *kh* is Ψ or ∇ ; and X or $\textcircled{+}$ denotes *ks* (*x*); elsewhere (in Asia, the islands, the rest of Greece proper) X is used for the *kh*-sound. It is difficult to suggest any plausible explanation of this irregularity. It may be noted that we also occasionally find $\phi\varsigma$ for ψ , instead of $\pi\varsigma$ (this last combination naturally remained unaltered in the western alphabet where ∇ denoted the *kh* sound); and $\chi\varsigma$ for $\kappa\varsigma$ or ξ . The symbols X and ∇ were probably once the common property of the eastern and western Greeks or of the common forefathers of the two divisions, and had each but one value: it is of course possible that they may have been borrowed independently by the eastern and western peoples from some foreign alphabet and applied to different uses: but this is not likely: they are apparently not Phœnician, and we do not know any other alphabet from which they are likely to have been borrowed. It is possible that they may have belonged to some ruder and simpler alphabet superseded by the Phœnician: and the combinations $\phi\varsigma$ and $\chi\varsigma$ ¹ indicate that ϕ and χ had in such an alphabet the values *p* and *k*. If this was so, it is not unnatural that X , superseded by K , should be employed to denote the cognate sound *kh* in the east: while

The symbols Φ and X .

¹ One thing at least seems clear: ϕ and χ cannot have denoted breathings at any time when the compounds $\phi\varsigma$ and $\chi\varsigma$ were in use.

CH. VII.

The symbol Θ .

in the west it apparently became restricted to the combination $X\Sigma$, which could then be cut down to X without any risk of confusion, the Σ being implied by the remaining symbol.

Both the name and form of Θ correspond to the Hebrew *Teth*; and its position in the alphabet agrees thereto. It is not used for τ , as ϕ and χ were for π and κ . Its Hebrew value is of course an argument in favour of those who believe that the Greek sound was a spirant, not an aspirate. Those who hold the contrary doctrine must assume that here (as well as for the vowels) a symbol was taken not with its original value, but one cognate to it: a change which is neither unnatural nor unusual.

Aspirate symbols not needed at Rome.

The three aspirates of the western Greeks, Θ , Φ , Ψ , were not adopted by the Romans when they took their alphabet from Cumae, as they had no sounds requiring such symbols. The symbol X was taken, but naturally with its western value (*ks*).

The sibilants.

The four Phœnician symbols for the sibilants (Samech, Shin, Tsadhe and Zain, representing, as is supposed, *s*, *sh*, *ts* and *dz*, respectively) were of course not all required by the Greeks, who had so little liking for this class of sound. One form (apparently) of Samech (Ξ) was taken in the alphabets of Asia Minor, Corinth, and Corcyra to denote *ks*: it was not required for this purpose in the western alphabets, as we have seen above. It was kept in its old place, but with a new name (*Xi*) as well as a new value. Another form of Samech supplied the ordinary Greek Σ , which corresponds to it in sound. The oldest Greek alphabets known to us—those of Thera, Melos, Crete, and the earlier forms of those of Athens, Corinth and Corcyra, have the form **M**—the equivalent of Shin—to denote *s*. Perhaps this was the case in other alphabets also: then the symbol was dropped, probably to avoid confusion with *m*: and one form of Samech (with the name *sigma*) was introduced into its place. It cannot be shewn that **M** had ever the value *sh* in Greece. It is just possible that *sigma*

may be an attempt to turn Samech into a form that should make it intelligible to Greek ears: but there seems to have been an older name *si*, seen in the compounds *k-si* and *p-si*; and it is not unnatural that a descriptive name should be given to an objectionable sound. Herodotus (i. 139) speaks of "the letter which the Dorians call *san*, and the Ionians *sigma*." *San* was no letter of the Ionic alphabet, but the name was preserved for them in the compound *sam-pi*, which denoted 900, and the name *σαμφώρας*.

It may be noticed that among the Italians the Umbrians and Etrurians (like the Dorians) had two symbols for *s*. The Latin and the Oscan alphabets dropped the second one.

Z corresponds in place and moderately in form (𐌆 always in inscriptions) to Zain (i.e. *dz*). It had most probably this sound in Greek, but it may have varied; it always represents some phonetic corruption, as will appear in its place. Perhaps the Greeks confounded the two compound sounds *ts* and *dz* (Tsadi and Zain), and kept but one symbol (Zain) with the name of the other (Tsadi) modified into *Zeta* to correspond to the nearest letters *Eta* and *Theta*. This amalgamation of the two sounds draws some probability from the fact that *ks* and *ps* had each its own special symbol assigned to them in some alphabets; but no symbol for *ts* was required.

Z occurs (as weak *s*) in Oscan and perhaps in old Latin: its value will be discussed below.

Koppa was retained by the Dorians, and universally in the table of numerals for 90. It passed with the rest of the Doric alphabet into Latin; and the downward stroke became by degrees more oblique.

The Latin *F* and *H* stand for lost aspirates; the *F* representing in form the *F* (i.e. *w*), for which the Latins regarded *v* as a sufficient representative: and the *H* in its old force.

Gamma

*The Latin
F and H.*

The symbols *Y* and *Z* in classical Latin were borrowed

CH. VII.

Latin
borrowed
symbols.

from the Greek, to express those Greek sounds which had no exact representatives in Latin. This new *z* differed from the old *z* mentioned above, i.e. from the French *z*: being the Greek *ζ*, whether that was *dz* or the French *j* or the English *j*. The Romans did not retain the Greek names for the symbols: the momentary consonants were denoted by their own sound followed by a vowel: on the other hand the continuous consonants were preceded by a vowel: the different names illustrate their different nature.

I shall now take the four heads of vowel-change in a slightly different order from that given in my sketch above, as follows: Substitution, Assimilation, Dissimilation, Loss. This will be found most convenient for the Latin.

I. SUBSTITUTION.

1. *Splitting of the A-sound.*

1. *A* = *a*, *e*,
o.

I shall commence with the most universal and most important change, that of Indo-European *A* into *ǣ*, *ē*, *ō* in Graeco-Italian, and *ā* into *ā*, *ē*, *ō*. I will give such evidence as can be given for the sound of these letters at the end of the section. There seems no reason to believe that this change was anything but phonetic. Short *e* and *o* are not raised powers of any of the simple vowels; and *a*, with which they are certainly connected, is heavier than either of them, the order in respect of weight being *a*, *o*, *e*; which is preserved in the conservative Latin. In Greek indeed, as I have mentioned above, the three vowels seem to be used in the *a*-scale, *a* being the radical; and *ε* and *ο* the first and second steps respectively. That *ο* is heavier than *e* is best seen by comparing the same formations in Sanskrit and in Greek: thus *jajāna* = *γέγονα*, where the short *a* of the Sanskrit is equivalent to *ε*, and long *a* to *ο*; similarly *bhārami* = *φέρω*, but *bhāra* = *φόρος*.

It was to be expected *a priori* that the strongest and

by far the commonest vowel of the original speech would be more corrupted in use than any other. Instances of its variation are common enough within our own island. The full sound of the *a* is more commonly retained in Scotland, whilst in England it has been thinned down to the *e*-sound, though spelt generally as *a*, and sometimes changed to *o*; in which case the Scotch frequently shews the *e*-sound, spelt as *ae* or *ai*. Thus the original *na* is still found in Scotland, but it is more commonly *nae* (*e*-sound); whilst as in England we have the same sound (with a glide), *na*, beside *no*. Scotch *awā* is English *away*. *Twā* is *two*, *snaw* is *snow*; but *baith* (*e*-sound again) is *both*, *laith* is *loth*, *gae* is *go*. In none of these changes is there anything dynamic: they are purely phonetic variations.

These instances would shew that this variation was not confined to the Graeco-Italian. It extended over all the European peoples; no doubt very gradually. I have already said it is not found in Sanskrit, which has no *ē* or *ō*, and its *ē*, *ō* are equivalents of *ai*, *au*. It seems therefore plain that the tendency was not felt till after the separation of the East from the West¹. This fact is at variance with the theory, that the North European families parted off from the Eastern, before the nations of Southern Europe had left them; since this change is certainly found in members of the Teutonic and Slavonic groups. Is it possible to solve this difficulty in any way, except by Fick's hypothesis²? Was there some connection again formed between the Germans and the Greeks after their first parting? This is most improbable. Was this vowel-change the result of independent phonetic action in the separated peoples? This again is hard to believe, when we see the simple words and roots which exhibit the same variation: but it is not impossible. The vowels *ε* and *ο* are produced by the first change in Greek and Latin, and afterwards sink to *ι* and *υ*: but in North European nations it is generally *e* which is developed from *i*, and *o* from *u*. The *ō* of the Slavonic

*Found
throughout
Europe.*

¹ By Curtius, *Gr. Et.* p. 88.

² See page 26.

CH. VII.

must have been developed after the separation of that language from the Lithuanian. The Keltic agrees in the tendency of its vowel-change mainly with the Teutonic: yet *a* in it could pass directly into *e* and *o*¹. These facts shew that different languages could arrive at the same sounds in different ways. It is indeed not impossible that a tendency to the change we are discussing may have existed even before the first separation. We can well imagine that there may even then have been dialectical differences, distinguishing to some extent the fathers of the future nations. The causes producing these differences need not have acted uniformly: while the ancestors of the Hindus and Greeks agreed in most points, the ancestors of the Greeks and the Germans may have agreed in one. This partial action would be quite in accordance with what I have said above about the formation of dialects within the Greek.

History of
the change
from *A* to *e*;

The weakening from *a* to *e* clearly was the first in time. It has spread more widely than that from *a* to *o* over the Western languages, and is also more prevalent in particular languages. Thus (to borrow one or two examples from Curtius) we find that from Indo-European *dakan*, "ten," have come Greek *déka*, Latin *decem*, O. H. G. *zehan*, Gothic *taihun* (modified from *tihun* by the phonetic law of the language by which *i* and *u* become *ai* and *au* before *r* and *h*), Slavonic *desęti*, Lith. *deszimti*, old Irish *deich*: we find Latin *pecu*, Lith. *peku*, Goth. *faihu* (from *fihu*), cattle, with no corresponding Aryan word: also from $\sqrt{\text{SAD}}$, "to sit," Greek *ēdos*, Latin *sedes*, Gothic *sita*, Lithuanian *sedmi*: from $\sqrt{\text{AD}}$, the Homeric *ēdō*, Latin *edo*, Lith. *edmi*, Goth. *itan*: from $\sqrt{\text{TRAP}}$ the Greek *τρέπω*, Latin *trepidus*, Scl. *trepati*. It will be observed that the Sclavo-Lithuanian agrees with the Greek and Latin: in the Teutonic family while the Old High German has *e* the Gothic has *i*. This *i* is sometimes said to be weakened from *e*, as also *u* from *o*²; but it is strange that the middle

¹ Ebel; *Celt. Stud.* p. 121.

² As by Curtius, *Gr. Et.* p. 88.

step should have passed away without a trace of it being left, for there is no *ē* or *ō* in Gothic. It is possible that this tendency was not fully developed within the Teutonic race till Goths were distinct from Germans, after which time each people carried out the change in its own way. At all events the use of *i* and *u* in Gothic is very parallel to that of *ε* and *ο* in Greek¹.

The tendency then to let *a* sink into *e* was clearly strong among the Western peoples before their separation. Fick, who has made a special investigation of the extent of the change, considers that it occurs in about thirty old nominal bases, and in the present stem of at least forty important verbs; whence it naturally spread to derivative nouns².

Traces of the change from *α* to *ο* are much harder to find. Thus³ *βους* and *bos* are the O. H. G. *chuo*, Slavonic *govęlo*. But whilst *aktan* is *octo* in Graeco-Italian, no vowel-change is to be seen in the Gothic *ahtau*, or Lithuanian *asztūni*; *ovis*, "a sheep," is *avis* in Gothic and Lithuanian as much as in Sanskrit: the Sanskrit *amśa* is *ᾰμος* and *umerus* (where the *u* is derived from *ο*), but remains *amśa* in Gothic: similarly we find *ᾰλένη* and *ulna*, but Gothic *aleina*, German *elle*. This tendency had scarcely begun to act at the time of the separation of the Northern and Southern peoples: it was then checked in the North, while circumstances, which we cannot now certainly ascertain, favoured its development among the Graeco-Italian people. It was more developed within the Northern races by the Slavo-Lithuanian than by the Teutonic. Thus *osī* is Slavonic for an "axle," which has *a* in all the other

and from
A to *ο*.

¹ Thus in Greek we had beside radical *τραφ*, the stems *τρεφ* and *τροφ*. Similarly in Gothic, the Indo-Eur. *BANDH*, "to bind," becomes *band*, whence *bandi*, "a band" or "bond," and *bandja*, "a prisoner:" the present of the verb is *binda* (analogous to *τρέφω*): and though *band*, "I bound," does not correspond to *τέτροφα*, but rather to *ἐτραφον*, yet *bundum*, "we bound," gives the required analogy—*i* : *u* :: *e* : *ο*. This *band* (singular) stands to *bundum* (plural) as *οἶδα* to *ἴδμεν*.

² *Einheit*, pp. 176—200.

³ Curtius, *Gr. Et.* p. 8.

CH. VII.

Change
from *A* to *e*
established
in Graeco-
Italian.

languages : *aga*, a goat (*aiξ*, &c.), is *ožys* in Lithuanian : *agni*, fire, is Slavonic *ogni*. We may now trace the progress of both changes among that people a little closer.

The change from *a* to *e* had passed widely over the language (as we should naturally have expected) before its division into Greek and Latin. It had seized on far the greater number of roots. AS had become *es* ; AD, "to eat," was *ed* ; BHAR was *bher*, &c. Even the suffixes had in numerous cases been affected by it. Thus *patar* had become *pater*, *-tara* was *-tero* (*δεξι-τερο-*, *dex-tero-*), *-mana* was *-meno-* as in *διδο-μενο-*, *vertu-m(e)no-* ; though in this and similar words, *alumnus*, *columna*, the *e* fell out altogether after passing through intermediate *i*, which survives in *terminus* and *femina*.

Still there are many words which either had not been attacked before the separation, or in which the "feeling" of one or other of the languages (one would like to naturalise, for it is impossible to translate, the admirable German "Sprachgefühl") preserved the older *a*. Thus we see *magnus* still retaining the old vowel, while the Greek *μέγας* has yielded ; compare also *anguis* with *ἔχis*, *manere* with *μένειν* : on the other hand, the Greek is more faithful in keeping *ἐ-λαχύς* by *levis*, *ἀχὴν* by *egenus* : *at* and *et* are both found by the side of Sanskrit *atha* and *ati*. It is interesting also to observe how the less cultivated dialects of the same language clung to the older form. Thus we find the Doric *τράφω* by the Attic *τρέφω* ; *ἰαρός* by *ἱερός*, and many others. In all such cases the Attic may have the weaker form ; but we may well say that its weakness is oftentimes its strength, when we remember how it can employ its old and new forms to express different orders of action.

Those roots which preserved the old *a* intact seem to have been most commonly those which contained a guttural. This we should expect, the position of the organs being similar in the formation of the two sounds. Thus AK, the widely-spread root denoting "sharpness," never

sank to either *ek* or *ok* with the short vowel: *ὠκὺς* and *ὄκι-ór* probably come through *ā*. Compare the numerous derivatives *ἄκων*, *ἄκωκή*, *ἄκρος*; *acus*, *acuō*, *acies*, &c. Similarly AG, PAG, TAG retain the *a* in both languages, as it was in the original. Sometimes however *a* sinks to *e* even before the guttural: as in *equus* (*ἄκνα*), and even to *i* in *ἵππος*: AG becomes *ἡγέομαι* in Attic. Moreover we find *a* in many cases where this explanation is not applicable. Thus *ambhō* (*ἄμφω*, *ambo*), *ambhi* (*ἀμφί*, *amb-*), are examples of the retention of the original vowel in Graeco-Italian, while the influence of the labials *m* and *bh* has produced *ubhdu* (Sk.), *uba* (Zend), *oba* (Slav.); *ambhi* has become *umbi* in old Saxon, *umpi* in O. H. G. (modern German *um*).

The transition from *a* to *o* is a much less accomplished fact. That it took place in Graeco-Italian times is shewn by the *o* occurring in both languages in many certainly old words: as *ὄφεις* = *ovis*: *βοφο* = *bovi-*; in both of these cases the *o* is already due to the following *v*. Further, *ὀκτώ* = *octō*, *δόμος* = *domus*; *ὄζειν* is answered by *odor*; *ὄρνυμαι* by *orior*; *ὀστέον* by *os(s)*; *ὄσσε* (*ὀκτε*) by *oculus*; *ὀπός* by *opimus*. Still the list is not great, especially of roots: and there are many examples which shew how partially the tendency acted. Thus we have *da-re* by the side of *δι-δό-ναι*, *asinus* by *ὄνος* (for *ὄς-νος*), *lauere* by *λούειν* (= *λοφειν*); whilst the Greek presents the original form in *μαλακός* (Latin *mollis*), in *καρδία* (Latin *cord-*), and others. We find the Greek dialects wavering: thus the Lesbian in general takes the *o*: as in the Aeolic poem which comes at the end of the Theokritean idylls we have *ὀμνάσθην* for *ἀναμνασθῆναι* and *ὄρπετον* for *ἄρπετον*¹; so Hesychius (*ἄρπετον* = *ἰκτῖνος* in Cretan): the word has nothing to do with *έρπετον*, which gives no sort of sense: and in Sappho's first fragment *ὀνία* occurs for *ἀνία* (l. 3)². We have *βροχέως* (2. 7), and *ὄν* = *ἀνά* is very frequent in

The change from A to o less frequent.

¹ Theok. xxix. 26 and 13. See Ahrens, i. 77, note.

² For other examples, see Ahrens, i. 76.

Lesbian inscriptions. But in the numerals we find the Doric *ἑκατι* corresponding to the Attic *ἑκοσι*: on the other hand, the vowel of *τέσσαρες* is older than that of the Doric *τέτορες*. And a similar wavering in the Attic is shewn by forms like *λέαινα* (for old *λεαν-γα*) by the side of *λεοντ-*; *τεκταίνομαι* (for *τεκταν-γο-μαι* by *τεκτον-*, Sanskrit *takshan*). As a general rule, however, the Doric is distinguished from the Attic by the *a*-forms: thus we have *ἄτερος*, *Ἰάρων*, &c., on good inscriptions: *γα* for *γε* is universal both in Doric and Aeolic: we also find forms like *τράχω* and *τράφω* in Theokritus and Pindar; but these last may be due to the over-subtlety of grammarians. Traces of the same change within the Latin may be seen in *portio* compared with *pars*; *scob-s* (by *scabere*), and especially in proper names, as Valerius and Volesus, Fabius and Fovius. In these last it is impossible that the change should have been dynamic, they are probably dialectical varieties, like Claudius and Clodius, Labici and Lauici, &c.: but this may have been the case with *scobs*, &c.

Applica-
tion of the
new vowels.

O is most commonly employed by the Greek in suffixes. Thus the original *navas* becomes *νέφος*, and the old Latin agrees in presenting *nouos*, weakened afterwards to *nouus*. So also *patar-as* (genitive of *patar*) becomes *πατερ-ίς*; in Latin this termination has further passed into *i*: *pat(e)ris*. In both Greek and Latin the formative suffix *os* (originally *as*) for neuter nouns sank to *es* in the oblique cases: thus *γένος*, genitive *γένε(σ)ος*: *genus* (originally *genos*), *generis*, for *genesis*. The suffix *as* is however retained without weakening in many neuter nouns, as *κέρας*; while in neuter adjectives it is weakened to *es* in the nominative, as *σαφές*. The participle-suffix *ont* (originally *ant*) has suffered the same weakening in Latin but not in Greek; compare Sk. *bharantam* with Gk. *φέροντα*, Lat. *ferentem*. One relic of the Graeco-Italian form is to be seen in *euntem*, weakened from *eontem*. It will be observed that here the Greek has retained the *a* in the case-suffix; and the rule holds generally that where

a final nasal has been lost, *a* is kept and not weakened to *o*: thus we find δέκα from *dakan* (*decem*), ἐπτά (*septem*), ἔδειξα from *a-dik-sam(i)*, the Sanskrit *adiksham*; compare Latin *dicebam*. In the vocative, Greek and Latin agree in weakening the Graeco-Italian termination *o* to *e*, the most convenient of all vowels to end a word. Passing to roots we shall find that *o* appears but sparingly in Greek; √οδ and √ορ have been mentioned above; the two languages agree as to the vowel; in Latin √vol (*uolo*, *volt*), weakened to *e* in *ueller*, &c., Greek √βολ in βολ-γο-μαι, Lesbian βόλλομαι¹, Attic βούλομαι: and *o* occurs very frequently in Latin roots, though mostly in connection with a *v*, as *uom-o* (Feμ-ε-ω), *uoc-o* (Gr. √Feπ), *uol-uo* (Feλ), &c., or other labial sound, as *mor-ior*, *dom-o*, &c., from which it may be inferred that the Graeco-Italian vowel was commonly *e*, which in Latin was assimilated to the form *o*.

Something has been already said of the great gain which the Greeks derived from this splitting of the *a*-sound: many examples are given in Curtius' Essay, already referred to². We have seen how they used the three vowels to distinguish the three stages of action, expressed by τραφ, τρεφ, τροφ: also to distinguish different cases which all originally had but one vowel, *a*, as πόδας, πόδες, ποδός³. The Latin here, as generally, gave up all its gain, in weakening all alike to *e*, though it then distinguished the genitive singular by further weakening to *pedis*. But perhaps it is in conjugation that we see best the strength and precision which the Greek has gained by the original weakening. It has been enabled thereby to employ the different vowels, for the root, the suffix, and the internal modification of the root. Thus, how much more varied in sound, how much more expressive of keen perception of logical distinction, is γέγονα than the Sanskrit *jajāna*. Here the *a* is left in

Especial gain of the Greek language hereby.

¹ Theok. xxviii. 15.

² *Con p. Phil. and Class. Scholarship*, p. 33 et seqq.

³ See p. 6.

both languages to form the suffix¹; but in Greek the radical vowel is changed to *o* instead of being merely raised from short to long *a*: whilst the reduplicated syllable is marked by the distinctive *ε*.

Compare too the first person plural *γεγόναμεν* with the Sanskrit *jajnima*. Here the use of the vowels *ε* and *ο* in the first syllables enables the Greek without sacrifice of euphony to keep the strong original *a* for the connecting vowel between the root and termination. The Sanskrit, on the contrary, allowed the *a* to sink into *i*: and the result was that the link was too weak to maintain the balance of the word, and it became corrupted, as *jajanima* for *jajnima*, and *tatanima* to *ténima*. Again, it is by this alternation of the *a* with the dull *ο* that the Greeks are able to distinguish one tense from another, as *ἐκτείναμεν* (aor.) from *ἐκτείνομεν* (imp.); *ἔχομεν* (pres.) from *ἐχέμεν*, the halfway form between *ἐχέμεναι* and *ἔχειν*. Lastly, the Greek is a great gainer by the three verbal forms in *-αω*, *-εω*, and *-οω*, as compared with the single *-αγάμι* of the Sanskrit. No doubt in practice this distinction of forms was not so well used as it might have been, by being rigidly applied to express distinct ideas. Still, on the whole, the Greek verbs in *-οω* have an active sense, and verbs in *-εω* are neuter (contrast *πολεμῶω* and *πολεμέω*), whilst those in *-αω*, being closely connected with nouns in *η*, suggest at once their meaning from their derivation². In Latin the vowel-system became rigid at too early a period to allow of the developments we see in Greek: consequently we find in it forms which have lost their distinctive meaning: thus *-(a)o* of the first and *eo* of the second conjugation are generally used merely as conjugational forms with no distinct trace of their old signification,

¹ The original suffix of course was *μ*; *a* was only the connecting vowel which facilitated the pronunciation of the two consonants. But, as we know, *μ* was lost; and thus from the grammatical point of view, *a* must be regarded as the existing suffix of the 1st person singular,

² *Comp. Phil. and Class. Schol.* p. 46.

There is one point which may be mentioned here, when we are estimating the gains of the Greek language. In *γέγονα* the *e* of the reduplicated syllable represents the true vowel of the root. But at the earliest period at which the language is known to us, this vowel had come into universal use in this particular syllable, to the exclusion of the radical vowel: we find, for instance, *τέτυφα* not *τύτυφα*, as we ought, and as we find in Sanskrit *tu-tôp-a*. And in the same way *ι* has come into universal use for strengthening the present stem by reduplication, in the somewhat rare instances where that method is employed; *δίδωμι* stands in contrast to Sanskrit *dadāmi*¹. In such cases Greek is less interesting than Sanskrit as a living organism; it is more beautiful as an almost perfect machine.

Side by side with the extension of *ǣ* to *ǣ̄*, *ǣ̆*, *ǣ̇*, stands that of *ā* to *ā̄*, *ā̆*, *ā̇*. Curtius goes so far as to say that for every Greek *ā̄*, *η̄*, *ω̄*, we may expect an original *ā̄*². However this may be, and it seems somewhat difficult to prove, at least some examples may be given to shew that the idea of this variation was present to the consciousness of the Graeco-Italian language as something possible, on the analogy of the division of short *a*, but much less strongly felt, inasmuch as the cases in which it could occur were much fewer. Thus *ὦκύ* and *ōci-us* stand together over against Sanskrit *ācu* from *AK*: and *√gnō*, despite the re-appearance of *ā̄* in *gnārus*, is certainly a Graeco-Italian form of the original *GNĀ*: *dōnum* with *δῶ(τι)s* may be another example: *uox* is perhaps an Italian variation of *vāk* (Sk. *vāch*): *pōtus*, Gk. *πῶμα*, must be compared with Sanskrit *pātra*. The entire vowel-range is found in the declension of the suffix *-tar*, as Sanskrit *datāram*, *δοτήρα* and *datōrem*; within the Greek *-τηρ* and *-τωρ* are used.

Traces of
similar di-
vision of *ā̄*.

¹ What is stated here of Greek, is true of Latin also to a considerable extent. Latin here occupies a sort of midway position between Sanskrit and Greek. Its system of reduplication will require fuller discussion afterwards.

² *Gr. Et.* p. 400,

CH. VII.

with apparent indifference; *βραχυτητο-* is in Latin *brevitāti-*. It is also found in the derivatives of a few roots: thus from SKAP, to support, we have *scāpus*, a stalk, which is also used in many derived senses, *σκήπτρον* (and the parallel forms *σκίπων* and *scipio*, which are weakenings through *e*) and *scōpus* or *scōpio*, perhaps *scōpae*. SVAD, the root of "sweetness," is short in *ἔαδον*, but *suāda* and *ῥδύς* give the first steps of the change, which is completed by old English "sote," i. e. sweet. So also in Greek and Italian we find *φᾶσις*, *fāri*, *φήμη*, *φωνή*: in Greek alone we have from *√βα*, the Greek equivalent of GA, to "come," *βᾶτος*, passable, *βηλός*, a threshold, and *βαμός*, a basement—commonly of an altar: compare *ara*, i. e. *ās-a*, the "seat" (root *ās*) or base of the *altare* or "high" thing raised upon it. Also, if Corssen be right¹, we have from MA, to measure, the short *a* in *mānus*, *μέτρον* and *mōdus*, *ā* in *mā-nus* (good, opposite of *immanis*, compare our phrase "estimable"), *ē* in *meta*, and *ō* in *mos*: if the connection had been a little more certain, I should have given this, as he does, as an example of vowel-intensification.

A well-known instance of the change in Greek is the weakening of *a* as a nominal suffix to *η* in Ionic, and to a less extent in Attic. The real nature of this change is quite lost in most grammars, which give *a* as a Doric broadening of *η*. The Aeolic also retains *a*. At least one change of *ā* to *ē* is seen in *εἶ* for the older *αι* (if). The Doric *ā* however sinks to *η* as well as the Attic in several words; e. g. in *κτῆμα*, *χρῆμα*, and all the derivatives of the roots *κτα*, *χρα*: so also the derivatives of *√βαλ* and *√καλ*, *βέβλημαι*, *κέκλημαι*, &c.: generally however these roots seem to have had a by-form in *ε*: we find *κτέανον*, *χρέος* and *χρέεσθαι*, *βέλος*, &c.: so that the variation may be traced back to the short vowels. In Doric we find original *ā* retained in a few words where the other Greeks had *ω*, e. g. in *πρᾶτος*=the Attic *πρῶτος*, *θεαρίς*=*θεωρός*, &c. These seem not to be Aeolic².

¹ L. 431.² Ahrens, I. 94.

I will now consider the probable sounds of these letters. The question is one of great difficulty, the evidence being not only scanty, but to some degree conflicting: the results therefore are not given as certain: but in the present state of our knowledge I think them the most probable. The results of the next sections, on the Latin and Greek diphthongs, and on vowel-change in general, will be assumed here to some extent.

of *A*,

First of all, there is not much trace of any variation of the *a*-sound in the classical times of either language. In Latin there is no indication of any change of sound. In Greek we have the fact, already referred to, that the order of vowel-strength in the *a* scale was *a*, *e*, *o*, which points to a sound for *a* different from the primary *a*. But I have said that this may be due to the analogy of the other two scales. The short *a* however is a difficult sound to keep pure: as is shewn by its regular sinking in Sanskrit and English to the sound of, e.g. the final *a* in *altar*: it is not impossible that it may have sometimes had this sound in Greece, especially in unaccentuated syllables. Local variations are also probable. Mr Roby¹ thinks that in the severer Doric the *a* may have been nearer to *o* than the Attic *a*, in consequence of the contraction (which is not however universal) of *ao* and *oa* into *a*; this certainly points to a broader sound of the *a*, nearer to (ō) or (aw). This, and not the retention of the *a* where the Ionic had *η*, may be the *πλατεια* of the Doric: which must then be extended to the Lesbian, but not to the Boeotian. The Boeotian *a* I should place nearer to the *e*-sound, about our (ǣ), on the evidence of the substitution of *η* for *αι*; *η* certainly differed in Boeotia from the sound it represented in the rest of Greece.

of *E* and *O*.

The sounds of *e* and *o* are more difficult. So far as I know, Mr Roby has been the first to hold that *η* and *ω* differed from *ε* and *ο* not merely in length or quantity²,

¹ *Grammar*, p. lxviii.² *Ibid.* p. lxvii.

CH. VII.

Probable
difference
in quality
between ϵ
and η ,
 \circ and ω .

but also in quality: that they were nearer to α . I think this very probable. There seems, in the first place, no reason why the Greeks should find new symbols necessary for the \bar{e} and \bar{o} , when they wanted none for \bar{a} , \bar{i} , or \bar{u} : and the history of the symbols (especially of ω) given at the beginning of this chapter, shews clearly that they were not so used in Greece during the fifth century. Secondly, the name $\epsilon \psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ does not denote any variation in quantity between ϵ and η : neither does it mean ϵ without the aspirate, according to the old explanation. It came into use after $\alpha\iota$ had sunk to the same value as ϵ : the different symbols for the same sound were then called $\epsilon \delta\acute{\iota}\phi\theta\omicron\gamma\gamma\omicron\nu$ or $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \delta\iota\phi\theta\acute{o}\gamma\gamma\omicron\nu$, and $\epsilon \psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$, i. e. ϵ denoted by a single sound: so also $\upsilon \psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ was thus distinguished from $\omicron\iota$, or $\upsilon \delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \delta\iota\phi\theta\acute{o}\gamma\gamma\omicron\nu$, when that diphthong was sounded as υ . But neither do the old names for epsilon and omicron, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ¹ and $\omicron\upsilon$, indicate difference of quantity; on the contrary, they do point to sounds of different qualities, to an e -sound and an o -sound, which if pronounced long would tend to be terminated by the i -glide and u -glide respectively, that is, to our (\bar{a}) and (\bar{o}), close e , and close o ². Then η and ω should be sounds which have no such diphthongal termination. But on which side of close e and close o did they lie? Were they nearer to α , or nearer to i and u respectively? Mr Roby, as I have said, puts them nearer to α : and I hold the same opinion, though doubtfully for η . In the case of ω there is less reason for doubt: it might indeed be the Italian close \acute{o} (as in *croce*), which, I think, is the only known sound between (\bar{o}) and (\bar{u}) in "pole" and "pull;" but I know no tendency shewn by ω , either in ancient or modern Greek, to pass into υ ³: on the other hand, the change from \omicron to υ was frequent in Lesbian: and in modern Greek (*valeat quantum*) both \omicron

¹ This occurs in Plato, *Cratylus*, 418 c.

² See page 95.

³ The Lesbian $\chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\nu\eta$ for $\chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\eta$ may be an exception.

and ω are nearly (aw)¹. I should place ω between open δ and (aw). It may have differed in different dialects. In severe Doric it was the result of oo , sometimes of ao and oa , in Attic of ao and oa always: Mr Roby thinks that this shews that o was nearer a in Doric than in Attic and, I suppose from his table², thinks that ω was the same in both dialects. I agree in thinking that there was probably not the same difference between ω and o in Doric as in Attic, but whether the two sounds were alike (aw) or (\bar{o}) I think we have no means of determining. The Lesbian o probably agreed with the Attic: that is, it was nearer to the u -sound in each dialect than ω .

I have said that I feel more doubtful about η than ω . In one respect there is less reason. I know no recognised middle sound between (\bar{a}) and (\bar{i}). Therefore if η was nearer to \bar{i} than (\bar{a}), instead of being nearer to a , it must almost certainly have been (\bar{i}) itself. But the universal contraction of ϵa into η ³, the contraction of ϵe into η in Doric and Aeolic, and into a in Attic, and the entire ignoring in every dialect of an ι after a at the end of a word, when coalescing with ϵ at the beginning of the next⁴, are all arguments for putting η between a and ϵ , not on the side of ι . On the other hand, there are some arguments for an i -sound. It is certain that $\eta = i$ in modern Greek. To this I should not attribute much weight if there were not some traces of a similar tendency in old Greek. The Boeotian tendency to ι will be mentioned in its place: this however does not go far enough: ι takes the sound of ϵi , and ϵi of η . Some examples given to prove identity of sound between ι and η are errors: thus $\gamma\iota\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ is certainly not equivalent in form to $\gamma\eta\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\varsigma$: and $\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\xi$ need not be derived from $\pi\eta\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$: it is rather from a secondary $\sqrt{\pi\iota\delta}$ of $\sqrt{\pi\iota}$: but in some words the connection is undeniable, as $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$

¹ Geldart, p. 19.

² *Grammar*, p. lxviii.

³ At least where a is found, it is found in every dialect: and its occurrence does not weaken the argument.

⁴ Thus $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$ becomes $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ or $\kappa\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$, according to the dialect, the ι being equally dropped.

and ἐπήβολος : and the forms in Aristophanes¹, βοῖ and βῆθεϊν, υῖ and ὑνυλα, certainly imply some similarity of sound. The well-known passage of Plato²—οἱ μὲν ἀρχαῖο-
τατοι ἰμέραν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκάλουν, αἱ δὲ ἑμέραν, οἱ δὲ νῦν
ἡμέραν—probably means that Plato had heard some
Greeks use the form ἰμέρα : any one who is conversant with
Plato's references to οἱ ἀρχαῖοι will not attach any deeper
meaning to the phrase than a polite refusal to investigate
a question any further : here at least it is perfectly certain
that the original vowel was *a* and not *i* : and *ε* was of
course used in ordinary Greek before *η* was established :
but it undoubtedly would appear to be the natural conclu-
sion from this passage, that the first vowel of the word just
before Plato's time wavered between *ε* and *ι*, and that *η*
afterwards expressed the sound more exactly. On the
other hand, we do not know what Greeks they were who
said ἰμέρα : we have no other evidence of the sound
having occurred anywhere. Mr Geldart rightly rejects any
evidence drawn from Cratinus' sheep which said (in our
texts) βῆ, βῆ : because in Cratinus' own spelling they
must have said βέ, βέ. On the whole I do not think that
any slight variations of the *η* to *ι* in classical times,
are sufficient to overbalance the distinct connection of
the sound with *a*. Semitic transcriptions of *η* by *i*
need not prove anything more than the absence of the *η*-
sound in those languages. Plutarch, transcribing Latin
words, gives κάρηρε, μαιώρης, ῥῆγας, &c. : and therefore I
should think that it was probably either è, or (ë) pro-
nounced long. A further piece of evidence with respect
to *ε* and *ο* is gathered by Mr Roby from transliteration :
ο represents both *o* and *u* in Latin, *ε* represents both *e* and
i in Latin : which would seem to place *ο* and *ε* in Attic
nearer to *u* and *i* than *ο* and *e* are in Latin.

Corre-
spondence

The sounds of *e* and *ο* in Latin are deduced by Prof.

¹ *Peace*, 925 and 238 : quoted by Geldart (p. 16), who believes that *η*
was = *i*.

² *Crat.* 418 c, quoted above.

Munro from the correspondence of modern Italian. In that language close *e* and *o* represent \bar{e} and \bar{o} in Latin (and also \bar{i} and \bar{u} , which is natural enough, see Table of Sounds in Chap. IV.): and open *e* and *o* represent \check{e} , *ae*, and \check{o} , *au*. Prof. Munro would give the open sound to the short vowels, and the close sound to the long vowels, distinguishing however between vowels naturally long and long by position. Mr Roby¹ makes some just deductions from the force of this rule: but, allowing for mistakes and variations, I think it on the whole the best we can get. The analogy of *ae* and *au* is curious, because *ae* was a single sound, and *au* was not. But they were each *open* sounds, though in a different way. The rule is in accordance with that mentioned² concerning English *i* and *u*: that the open sound is regularly short, and the close sound long. There is however a discrepancy between the theories here given of Greek and Latin pronunciation of *e* and *o*, which at first sight seems fatal to their truth: η corresponds nearly to \check{e} : and ϵ to \bar{e} . But it must be remembered that we are speaking solely of the *quality* of the sounds, not of their quantity: and in each quality it is possible to have both long and short sounds. It ought however to be stated that when the sounds of one language had to be represented in the other, \check{e} and \check{o} were regularly represented by ϵ and o , and \bar{e} and \bar{o} by η and ω ; in Latin also the quantity of the Greek vowel was generally maintained: the more obvious difference of quantity in such cases must have caused the subtler difference of quality to be ignored. Words which are not borrowed, but which correspond in the two languages, agree in length in far the greatest number of cases, but not always: e.g. $\theta\acute{\eta}\rho = f\acute{e}r\bar{a}$, $\eta\pi\alpha\rho = i\check{e}c\bar{u}r$ ³. I do not assign much weight to the statement of the grammarians (quoted by Roby) that " \check{o} *primis labris exprimitur, \bar{o} intra palatum sonat:*" which, if received, would contradict the theory given above: because they were separated by too

¹ Grammar, p. lxx.² At p. 98.³ Roby, p. 73.

long a time to make the statement trustworthy; and it is unsatisfactory in itself: the share of the palate in producing the more open sound of *o* is much less perceptible, and hence this *o* might not unnaturally be thought to be sounded by the lips alone: in reality both organs must be employed in each sound. Mr Roby does not appear to draw any distinction between open and close sounds of *e* and *o* in Latin. I think the evidence of Italian usage, though not convincing, yet sufficiently strong to justify me in arranging the Latin sounds accordingly.

Subjoined is a possible table of the single vowel-sounds of both languages. The idea is borrowed from Mr Roby¹: whose table should be compared with this. I differ from him sometimes, but never without the feeling that he is more likely to be right than I am.

	I (ee) (I)		E (â) è		A _o (ê) (â)		A (ah)	A _o (ö) (aw)		O ò (ō) ó (It.)		U (û) (oo)	
Lat.	î	ÿ?	ei	ē	ě	ae	a			ö	ō	û?	û
Attic	ι		ει	ε	η		α			ω	ο		ου υ
Dor. (sev.)	ι		ει	ε	η		α			ω, ο?			ου, υ
Lesb.	ι		ει	ε	η		α			ω ο			υ
Boeot.	ι, ει		η	ε			α			ω, ο?			ου

¹ See p. lxviii.

2. *Greek Diphthongs.*

The substitution of *a, e, o* for original *α* led of course to a corresponding increase in the number of diphthongs, in Latin originally as well as in Greek : but the Latin had suffered almost the whole of them to fall into disuse before the classical period of its literature. In Greece the number of the symbols for the diphthongs was still further increased in classical times by the introduction of *η* and *ω*. Thus the language possessed in the room of the original *αι, αυ, ει, ου*, no less than ten symbols *αι, ει, οι, αυ, ευ, ου, ηι, ωι, ηυ, ωυ*, besides the rather rare *υι*. The diphthong *ιυ* is only found in the Teutonic family.

There seems no reason to doubt that these were all at first what their name implies, double sounds ; in which the transition from the first to the second sound was distinctly audible. It is probable from the nature of the case that two sounds should be sounded as two, and probable also from their origin. When it was not a dynamic modification of a simple vowel intensifying the idea which that vowel conveyed, a diphthong arose, either from the coalition of two distinct vowels by the loss of an intermediate consonant, e.g. *λέγε(μ)εν* : or secondly, from a spirant being resolved into a vowel in accordance with laws of consonantal substitution to be mentioned in their place, e.g. *ἀνδρεῖος* from *ανδρε-γο-ς*, *λόγοιο* from *λογο-συο* (where the *σ* has left no trace of itself) : or thirdly, from the prolongation of the original vowel-sound to compensate for the loss of a following consonant ; thus when *ν* was lost in *μονσα* the first form must have been *μοοσα*, as is shewn by the Doric *μῶσα*, while the new vowel was weakened to *υ* in Attic *μοῦσα*, to *ι* in Aeolic *μοῖσα*. These new diphthongs often remained double sounds in Lesbian later than any other form of Greek

2. *AI*=*αι*,
ει, οι ;
AU=*αυ*,
ευ, ου.

Diphthongs
were origi-
nally
"double
sounds."

speech: thus we find ζοῖα, Αχιλλέιος¹, &c. where the ι is a resolved γ: this liking for open vowels sometimes extended even to diphthongs which were the result of vowel-intensification, as οἶδα, κῶιλος (i.e. κοF-ιλο-ς from κυ). In Homer also we find πᾶις, δῆις, which afterwards became monosyllables: and large masses of open vowels caused by inflexion, which were afterwards contracted. These examples shew the direction which the language followed from double to single sounds. But in whatever way these vowels were brought together, it is clear that they would not at once coalesce into one sound; λέγεμεν, for example, would for some time assert its right to an unimpaired number of syllables: but the crasis would begin in the case of identical vowels meeting: similar vowels would then be modified, and, lastly, by analogy even dissimilar ones. "Similar vowels" are α, ε, ο, as sprung from the same origin, and so passing more easily into each other; each of them is "dissimilar" to ι and υ.

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to trace the history of the Greek diphthongs, and fix the time when they ceased to be double sounds—each sound presumably the same as when it occurred separately; neither can we do more than guess with more or less of probability at the new single sound of each. There can be no doubt that the corruption of the diphthong must have been little later in time than the causes which produced it. Two vowels following immediately upon each other are commonly troublesome to pronounce; the most simple (and probably the oldest) combinations of language shew us vowel and consonant occurring alternately²: when a consonant fell out and two vowels met, there must have been at once a tendency to subordinate one vowel to the other: so that one of the two should become a "glide," i.e. a sound too short to be called a perfect vowel, because it never

*History
of the
change of
dissimilar
diph-
thongs in
Greek.*

¹ Theok. xxix. 5 and 34. See Ahrens, i. 105.

² See Leo Meyer, *Vergl. Gram.* i. 285, where numerous examples of Greek and Latin diphthongs are given, from which I have borrowed largely in this section.

receives any definite position, which yet is not a consonant because the voice-channel is too open to allow of any friction in the mouth. Thus in our word "boy" we have a full vowel, the same as that heard in *on* (ō), followed by a sound which if it had sufficient duration would be *i* (ee); but it is not held any time: yet it is not the consonant *y*, for the tongue is not brought near enough to the palate; the difference between it and the consonant may readily be heard by any one who will first pronounce "boy" naturally, and then *bō* followed by the true *y*. The same combination is heard when a consonant follows, as in "boil." This second indefinite element is a glide: and in every diphthong one of the elements tends to become a glide as soon as the exact balance between the two concurrent vowels is overthrown. Next, this glide tends to fall out altogether: thus, instead of "boy" we sometimes hear only *bo'*: this probably was the tendency in Greek. Sometimes however the two sounds can coalesce into a third one, as *oi* into *u*.

Obviously that one of the two elements would most naturally become a glide which was most akin to some consonant. Now, as we have already seen, *a* has no affinity to any consonant; but *i* and *u* are pronounced with the organs nearly in the positions for *y* and *w* respectively. Consequently we should expect them to be the sufferers in the struggle between the two members of the compound for independent existence; we should expect them either to become subsidiary sounds, only exerting some influence in modifying the purer vowel, or to be lost altogether. Now in all the diphthongs we are considering, *i* and *u* are the final elements. When the first element is the unmodified *a*, then we shall expect that it will hold its own. But when *o* and *e* have taken the place of *a*, the conditions are not so simple. The first indeed is pronounced with the tongue far back in the mouth, most near the guttural (or rather back palatal) point of contact. Now the fricative which can be formed

at this point is the harsher German *ch* (the sound of *nach* or *auch*, not that of *ich*), which is found neither in Greek nor in Latin. There was no consonant therefore to form the other limit for a glide corresponding to *o*, like *y* for *i* or *w* for *u*: accordingly *o* like *a* may be expected to hold its own. The case is different with *e*: it is a front vowel, though not so far forward as *i*. But the position of the tongue is almost as near that for *y* as the position for *i* is. Consequently when *e* and *i* meet we may expect a conflict of nearly equal powers.

In Greek the same word is found with different sounds as far back as the days of the Iliad and Odyssey. Thus Leo Meyer¹ quotes *κυνοραιστῶν*², but *θυμοραιῖστῶν*³: and there is plenty of variety in the case-terminations, like *τείχει*, *τείχει*, &c. If we pass from the earliest to the latest classical literature of Greece, we shall find in the Aeolic idylls of Theokritus⁴ proof that at least in some words in certain parts of Greece the double sound could be retained even to the Alexandrian period: still we may probably safely say that at that time the single sound was almost universal. Our best evidence for the character and progress of the weakening is to be found in the change of the spelling in different dialects. Here the tendency is too marked to be doubtful: the second vowel of dissimilar diphthongs is commonly dropped in writing—in Doric, as *χάλκεος*, *εὔρεα*⁵, &c.—and still more in Aeolic, especially in the Boeotian variety of the dialect, accompanied often by a weakening of the first vowel also: thus Ahrens quotes the forms *ἀρχῆος* (for *ἀρχαῖος*), *Ἀχρῆος*, *ἵππυς* for *ἵπποις*, *αὐτῷ* for *αὐτῶ*; even sometimes where the diphthong is dynamic, as *Φυκία* for *Φοικία*⁶. The Attic,

Tendency to drop the second vowel, the first being sometimes modified.

¹ *Id.* p. 298.

² *Od.* xvii. 300.

³ *Il.* xvi. 591.

⁴ See examples on last page but one.

⁵ Theok. ii. 30, vii. 78. I am aware of course that Theokritus does not even in the strictly bucolic poems always use pure Doric forms: but I quote from him only when the principle in question could be proved from other less accessible authorities, such as the fragments of Epicharmus and Sophron, or the inscriptions in Boeckh's *Corpus*.

⁶ *Gr. Dial.* i. 187.

on the contrary, keeps the full symbol: though in all likelihood it, like the rest of Greece, was losing the full sound, perhaps more slowly. Curtius suggests¹ that *ει* and *οι* must have been double sounds in B. C. 403, the year of the introduction at Athens of the symbols *η* and *ω*: otherwise what would have been gained by the distinction between *ει* and *ηι*, *οι* and *ωι*? This argument, however, loses its cogency; if *η* and *ω* represent different qualities, not merely different quantities of vowel-sound. Some change of pronunciation from the old to the new school is shewn by the often-quoted lines of Aristophanes (*Clouds*, 849):

ἰδού, κρέμαι', ὡς ἡλίθιον ἐφθέγγετο
καὶ τοῖσι χεῖλεσιν διερρηκόσιν.

Greek *αι*,

The second line gives no very clear indication of the pronunciation of the *αι* by the still old-fashioned Pheidipides: yet at least it shews that the new sound was thinner, perhaps like (*ā*) or German *ae*: which would correspond to the *ae* by which *αι* was transliterated in Latin; for *ae* had the *e*-sound, that is, either (*ā*) or the open Italian *e*, in the days of Lucretius², and probably much earlier. It may, I think, be considered at least probable, that *αι* when fully sounded was (*ah*) followed by a clear *i*: which probably, in Lesbian at least, passed into the *i*-glide, so that the sound would be that of our "aye," or "sigh" pronounced broadly: this seems likely from the curious Lesbian forms *θναίσκω*, *μαχαίτας* from original *α*, which the Ionic weakened to *η*, combined with the fact that, in the same Lesbian, *ι* was often omitted altogether where it was written in the rest of Greece, e.g. in *Ἄλκαος*: and the same argument may be drawn from the Lesbian forms *τάλαις* for *ταλανς* (*τάλας*) and *φαισί* for *φαντι* (*φασί*), &c.: all these point to a full *a*-sound, followed by a glide, or by nothing at all. In the Attic Greek of the best period

¹ *Erläuterungen zu meiner Schulgrammatik*, p. 19. See also *Studien zur Griech. und Latin Grammatik*, Vol. i. part 2, p. 276.

² *Corss. Ausspr.* i. 695.

there is nothing to shew that the two sounds were not heard, or that the *α* had been modified: but it undoubtedly was by degrees reduced to one of the *ε*-sounds: we see this in Boeotian where *καί* is represented by *κή*, *Θηβαῖος* by *Θειβῆος*, in many inscriptions¹; and the change was probably universal in the Alexandrian period: this is indicated by the rhyme of *ἔχει* to *ναίχι* in Callimachus' well-known epigram²:

Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός· ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς, ἡχώ φησί τις 'ἄλλος ἔχει.'

Greek *ει*.

In reading the Greek of Sophocles and Plato we should probably do well to give both sounds as far as possible. The diphthong *ει* seems to have wavered in sound between *ε* and *ι*, neither sound being strong enough to absorb or exclude the other universally. The variations of the different dialects shew a preponderating tendency to the *ε*-sound: in modern Greek it has become *ι*, as so many other sounds have. In strict Doric we find *η* where the rest of Greece has *ει* (*λέγην* not *λέγειν*): now this *η* is not likely to have differed in kind from the rest of Greece: if it was, as has been suggested, an *ε*-sound nearer to *α*, it would seem probable that *ει* in these cases was a closer *ε* with a glide³. In most dialects we find some interchange between *ι* and *ει*: thus, in a Delphic inscription⁴, we find *τειμά* and *Νεικοστράτα*: *Ποτίδαν* and *πόλι* (dative) are Doric⁵; *ἱρήν* (for *εἰρήν*) is Ionic; *ἴλη* is commoner than *εἴλη* in Attic: in Lesbian there is little confusion till late inscriptions⁶. But in Boeotian *ι* is found regularly where

¹ So also in Corinna, *Frag.* 12:

μέμφομη δὲ κῆ λιγουράν Μουρτίδ' ἰώνγα
ὅτι βανά φούσ' ἔβα Πινδάραιο ποτ' ἔριν.

² xxviii. 56 (ed. Meineke).

³ Westphal (*Gr. Gram.* p. 67) regards *ει* as diphthongised from *η* in all cases where they occur in dialectic varieties of the same word. This is inconsistent with my view of the nature of *η*: but possible if *η* were nothing but long close *ε*. Still it is very improbable that no traces of such a middle step should have been left in Attic.

⁴ C. I. G. No. 1709. 6.

⁵ Ahrens, ii. 184.

⁶ Ibid. i. 97.

ει is found in the rest of Greece: we have λέγεις and ἴμι; in Boeckh's list are ἱράνα, κιμένας, Φιδίας (for Φειδίας¹), &c., and many others. Since, however, ει occurs in Boeotian with equal regularity where η is found in the rest of Greece (μεγαλοσθένης and θουγάτειρ in the few remaining fragments of Corinna, φίλειμι Θειβῆος mentioned above, ἀνέθεικαν on inscriptions², Ἰσμενιάτας, &c.), we may conclude with fair certainty that ει was generally sounded nearer to η in the rest of Greece (despite the exceptions mentioned above), and had become ι in Boeotia. Considerable wavering is seen in the Latin transliteration. No doubt this test is not so sure in the case of the diphthongs as of the other sounds, because the Latins lost their diphthongs at so early a period: but the variation of spelling in Latin, where we have sometimes *e* and sometimes *i*, may be fairly taken to prove at least the various pronunciation in Greek: e.g. *gynaeceum* and *platea*, but *Iphigenia*. I conclude that the sound was sometimes that of our "grey," where the first vowel is predominant, and the second a glide—sometimes like "either" (old pronunciation): the varying sound of this word, and the varying spelling *ee*, *ei* and *ie* in English³, shew the flexibility of the combination: *ε* becomes *α* in Lesbian, as ἱρον in Theokritus⁴, and in inscriptions. The sound of *οι* is probably given pretty correctly by our English "boy:" it then passed into a modified *u*-sound—the common Upsilon—as we have seen in the Boeotian, e.g. τῦς for τοῖς, λευκοπέπλῡς is the dative plural in Corinna, and ἐμύ is ἐμοί: *υ* also stands for *ωι* as in τῷ δάμῡ (frequent on inscriptions); these shew an early affinity for *υ*, into which, according to Curtius, it had passed universally in the fourth century of our era⁵. It must have sounded as *υ* before the term

Greek *οι*.

¹ Nos. 1563 and 1569.

² E.g. 1593.

³ The history of these changes is elaborately traced by A. J. Ellis in his *Early English Pronunciation*; see especially pp. 92 and 104.

⁴ xxviii. 4.

⁵ See an interesting article by the late Prof. Hadley on *Byzantine Greek Pronunciation*, published in the Transactions of the American

CH. VII.

Greek *av*.Greek *ov*.

ὑψιλόν came into use: see p. 242. Then it passed at a much later period to *i*, which sound it has in modern Greek¹. Those diphthongs which ended with *u* probably allowed the second sound to drop into a glide very soon. There is no variation in the use of *av*: and there is every reason to believe that it was sounded like the German *au*; i.e. a pure *a* followed by the *u*-glide; the sound of our "how" is not very far from it: according to Bell, the first is a low-, the second a middle-back-wide. Next *ov* had quite, or very nearly, the sound of Indo-European *u*, which had been weakened in Upsilon, as will appear in its place. This is shewn by the transliteration into and from Latin: Greek *ov* becomes *u*; Μοῦσα is *Musa*; on the other hand, Latin *u* regularly appears as *ou*, as Πήγουλος; sometimes as *eu*, Λεύκιος, very rarely as *o* or *u*. No doubt the Latins had no *ou* left by which to represent *ov*; but the sound had not so entirely vanished that it could not have been recalled and used for the purpose of greater accuracy, if it had seemed necessary. But the position of the tongue for *o* and for *u* is so close that there is a great tendency to slide from the first into the second: the great difference lies in the position of the lips, which are much more rounded for *u* than for *o*: accordingly, where *u* follows *o*, the passage of the compound into *u* is almost inevitable. The change was a convenient one for the Greeks, who (with the exception of the Boeotians) let their *u* sink into *v*, to have this *ov* left to denote the original simple sound. Perhaps the Athenians retained something of the *o*-sound longer than the rest of the Greeks, for we find οἱ μὲν ἔχουσι τάφο μέρος in the inscription of the Athenians who fell at Potidaea, B.C. 432². It is not likely that this τάφο is the Doric form of the genitive: rather this spelling

Philological Society for 1872. It is therein shewn from some Anglo-Saxon transliterations of the Greek Testament, that the iotacism of modern Greek could not have been established in the latest classical Greek.

¹ Curtius, *Erläut.* p. 24 (Engl. Trans.).

² See Thiersch, *Gr. Gram.* pp. 40 and 77 (Engl. Trans.).

shews simply that *o* was still predominant in the compound, the glide perhaps being dropped. The strict Doric rigorously suppressed the glide and wrote *λόγω*, not *λόγου*: but this *ω*, as has been pointed out, was probably akin to (*aw*). The last diphthong *eu* is most difficult of all. No help can be got from the Latin, which had lost both *eu* and *ou* at a very early date: however when a vowel followed, as in *Euander*, the *u* was probably sounded as a *w*. But the Greeks wrote *Lucius* as *Λεύκιος*, perhaps on the analogy of *λευκός*. This would seem to shew a preponderance of the *u*. The great variations of *eu* in modern languages shew the extreme instability of the compound: contrast the French *eu* with the German, which is a somewhat sharper sound than our *oi*. I can see no reason for its being so in Greek: still less that it was sounded as *ef*—as it is in modern Greek before any consonant but a soft mute. I know no important variations of its use in the dialects. It is best to sound it as near a diphthong as possible, retaining the original sound of the vowels: if pronounced quickly, the sound will be very like our *u* (i. e. *yoo*): this is at least better than the French or the German sound.

No doubt the second vowel of all these six diphthongs, where it preceded another vowel, passed not merely into a glide, but into its corresponding semi-vowel *y* or *w*—from which indeed it had often originally sprung. On no other hypothesis can we conceive the possibility of sounding combinations like *αιεί* or *εῖοι*.

The diphthongs formed with *ā*, *η* and *ω* need not detain us long. That *āi*, *ηι*, *ωι* soon became monophthongs is evident from the nature of the sounds, for it is impossible to give the *ι* more than the slightest effect after the long preceding vowel, and from the fact that the *ι* was so early 'subscript,' the symbol, though not the sound, being retained doubtless to avoid confusion between cases and persons which would otherwise have been identical. The others, *ηυ* and *ωυ*, can scarcely have differed in sound from

Greek *eu*.

*Diphthongs
with first
vowel long.*

CH. VII.

eu and *ou*, and were as a matter of fact soon disused even by their inventors, though retained by grammarians for the sake of symmetry.

Greek *ui*.

Lastly, *ui* could allow either part to pass into the cognate semi-vowel, generally, no doubt, according as a vowel preceded or followed it. The latter is more common, and therefore e.g. *uíos* would be sounded *huyos*: but it might also be sounded *hwios*, and probably was so, if the *o* were ever dropped, so that *uíos* should become *uí̄s*.

Similar
diph-
thongs.

All the diphthongs which we have described so far, arose from the union of dissimilar vowels. What took place when similar vowels—*a*, *e*, *o*—met? Sometimes they became a diphthong, neither symbol being changed, but the two sounds tending more and more to coalesce into one (as in the cases above mentioned), e.g. *θεός*, &c. But this was comparatively rare. As a rule the combination of sound was effected by the ordinary laws of phonetic change. The effort to produce two distinct vowels one after the other was too great, and therefore the difference was done away. The stronger vowel either sank into the weaker (Substitution) or assimilated it to itself (Assimilation). The two identical vowels remained for some time side by side: then they either coalesced into one long vowel, or by a further process of substitution, principally found in the Attic, the second vowel was again weakened, and so a new, and this time dissimilar, diphthong was produced. Of the diphthongs, however, so produced, *ou*, *ei*, *eu*; the first, as we have seen, was decidedly monophthongal: the second inclines either to *e* or to *i*, that is, to a single sound: the last is uncertain. They are all compounds of sounds produced immediately together in the mouth, and so have a greater tendency to one single sound than the others. Generally, therefore, it appears that dissimilar diphthongs tend to remain double sounds, and similar diphthongs tend to become single sounds. The changes I am going to describe are quite familiar; they occur in every noun and verb. But since grammars

do not generally give any principle for these variations and merely call them "dialectical," I think it worth while to exhibit them in a connected form to make plain. The examples are taken chiefly from Leo Meyer and Ahrens, as before.

The six possible combinations of similar diphthongs are $a + e$, $a + o$, $e + a$, $e + o$, $o + a$, $o + e$. Those in which a is the final vowel rarely occur except in inflections. Now in all these cases we see in the different dialects sometimes substitution, sometimes assimilation, sometimes both. In order to treat them all together I shall be obliged therefore to bring in here my account of Greek vowel-assimilation, which I do with the less reluctance because it is only found in these combinations, and, as I have before said, is a very unimportant agent of phonetic change in Greek. The middle step is given as often as it occurs.

1. $a + e = a + a = \bar{a}$: as $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota = \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota^1 = \alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$
 $= \epsilon + \epsilon = \eta$: as $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\epsilon = \acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$.

This last weakened form is universal in Doric². Beside $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ may be set the Epic $\gamma\omicron\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu$ for $\gamma\omicron\alpha\text{-}\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu$. In the first change the stronger a has assimilated to itself the weaker e ; in the second the e has been substituted for the original a ³. The same processes will be seen in all the other combinations. As in the first case, in Doric $a + \eta = a + \bar{a} = \bar{a}$, as $\acute{\alpha}\eta\delta\acute{\omega}\nu = \acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu^4$. $\alpha\iota + \epsilon$ (when in two words) become \bar{a} in Attic, η in the other dialects: $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$ but $\kappa\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$. There are a few instances of \bar{a} in Lesbian⁵. The unimportance of the ι beside the a is shewn by its absorption altogether here.

¹ Il. x. 120. This view that $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ &c. are middle forms between $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ —not resolved forms of $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ —has been postulated by Prof. F. D. Allen (*Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* 1873): and some valuable deductions drawn as to more complex Epic forms of verbs in $\alpha\omega$.

² Theok. vi. 45; cf. ζῆρ, vii. 50, &c.

³ This explanation is not inconsistent with the statement already made, that Doric a , e and o may probably have varied from the sounds which those symbols represented in Attic. Even though this be so, there is still work left for substitution and assimilation.

⁴ Mosch. iii. 9.

⁵ Alcaeus, *Frag.* 79.

2. $\alpha + o = \alpha + a = \bar{\alpha}$:	as ἄος (Attic ἔως)	= ἄς (Dor., Aeol.)
	ἐπάξασο	= ἐπάξα ¹ ,
	Ἄλκμάων	= Ἄλκμᾶν,
	Κρονίδα(σγ)ο	= Κρονίδα,
= $o + o = \omega$:	as ὀράων	= ὀρώων ² = ὀρών,
	κέρας	= κέρως,
= $o + u = ou$:	as Κρονίδα(σγ)ο	= Κρονίδου.

Similarly by analogy,

$\alpha + ou = o + ou = o + \omega = \omega$:

as γοάουσα = γοώωσα³ = γοῶσα,

γελάουσα = γελώωσα⁴ = γελῶσα

(but γελᾶσα is also Doric, where the α has assimilated the ou).

The ω in the participle of the contracted verbs may also have arisen by compensation for the loss of the y : and so Curtius explains it⁵.

From these two combinations it will be seen that breadth of sound is by no means necessarily the characteristic of the Doric as opposed to the Attic. In the second, indeed, the Doric and Aeolic α assimilate the o , and thus we see, for example, the broad Κρονίδα and ἄν, instead of the Attic Κρονίδου and ὦν (from ἄων): but in the first combination it is the Doric which substitutes η for α , and so gets the thinner sound ἐνίκη instead of Attic ἐνίκα. No doubt as a general rule the Doric retained broad sounds, which were refined in the Attic so as to substitute elegance for strength; but this rule has many exceptions, which confirm the statement I have already made, that dialects are the result of *imperfectly* developed tendencies. There are however also sufficient examples of $\alpha + o = \omega$ in Doric: they are nearly always so formed to avoid confusion with other words. Thus we have the first persons singular, τιμάω, &c. = τιμῶ, &c.; and the ω is commonly found in monosyllabic roots, e.g. λῶντι, ζῶντι, &c.:

¹ Theok. iv. 28.

² Il. i. 350.

³ Il. xxii. 363.

⁴ Theok. i. 96.

⁵ Erläut. p. 115; see also the article by Prof. Allen mentioned above.

in the subjunctive however we have *a*, e.g. $\beta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\varsigma^1$; $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$ and $\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$ occur upon inscriptions. *a* + ω in another word also give ω , as $\tau\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\iota\alpha^2$; also $a\iota + \omega$, as $\kappa\acute{\omega}\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron^3$. In Attic $a\iota + \omicron\upsilon$ gives $\omicron\upsilon$, as $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\breve$.

3. $\epsilon + a = a + a = a$, esp. after a vowel: $\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\iota\acute{\epsilon}\alpha = \acute{\upsilon}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}$.
 $= \epsilon + \epsilon = \eta$; $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\alpha = \tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\eta$,
 $\epsilon\text{-}\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha = \eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$.

This combination is rare. In Latin, as Leo Meyer observes⁴, it remains unaltered, as in *aurea, doceam*, &c.

4. $\epsilon + \omicron = \omicron + \omicron = \omega$: as $\epsilon\text{-}\omicron\phi\lambda\omicron\nu = \omicron\phi\lambda\omicron\nu$,
 $\phi\iota\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\omega = \phi\iota\acute{\lambda}\acute{\omega}$,
 $= \omicron + \upsilon = \omicron\upsilon$: as $\phi\iota\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu = \phi\iota\acute{\lambda}\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$
 $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma = \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$,
 $= \epsilon + \upsilon = \epsilon\upsilon$: as $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\epsilon\omicron\nu = \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\nu^5$,
 $\omicron\breve\rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma = \omicron\breve\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$.

The last change—to $\epsilon\upsilon$ —is very restricted in its area, apparently to the southern coasts of Asia Minor and the adjoining islands. It does not seem to be Aeolic: at least the examples in Alcaeus and Sappho are uncertain, and it is not found in inscriptions: it is certainly not Boeotian. $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega$ occur in Corinna. Neither does it belong to the severe Doric; either ω (more rarely $\omicron\upsilon$) is found or a variation peculiar to this form of Doric, by which ϵ passes into ι : e.g. in $\mu\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega$. It seems to be Sicilian, but only in the pronouns: it is very common in Theokritus, who however may have got it from Cos. In Ionic (e.g. in Herodotus) it is very common: it also occurs frequently in Hesiod⁶; but it is not found in Attic. In the second change—as in the third of (2), and again in the second of (6)—we see that when $\omicron + \omicron$ come together the second sound sinks to υ , especially in the Attic Greek. The second vowel has assimilated the first to itself, and then, unable to maintain itself beside its self-created rival,

¹ Theok. xv. 22.

² Theok. iv. 16.

³ Verg. Gram. p. 294.

⁴ Id. iv. 30.

⁵ Il. xii. 160.

⁶ As $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\nu$, Op. et D. 297, 395; $\tau\epsilon\upsilon$, ib. 328; $\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$, ib. 474; and a good many others.

in the other dialects) of $\epsilon + \sigma$, e.g. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$ for $\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\mu\acute{\iota}$ (Lesbian $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\acute{\iota}$, severe Doric $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\iota}$, softer Doric $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$ ¹): of $\epsilon + \nu$; e.g. $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$ (severe Doric $\eta\acute{\varsigma}$): of $\epsilon + \nu\tau$, as $\tau\upsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$: of $\epsilon + \nu\theta$, as $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ for $\pi\epsilon\nu\theta\text{-}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. Again, $\omicron + \delta = \omicron\upsilon$, as $\pi\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$: $\omicron + \nu\tau = \omicron\upsilon$ in $\delta\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$. These changes might be explained on precisely the same principle as those above; that is, that $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\acute{\iota}$ became $\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}$, and then $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\iota}$; the middle form could be supported by the Doric $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\iota}$ and perhaps by the Aeolic forms to be mentioned below. But it is perhaps simpler, and more in accordance with the views already set forth, to explain this $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ as the natural result of the voice dwelling upon ϵ ²; namely, that when we sound (a), as has been already pointed out, an i -glide arises naturally after it: and similarly a u -glide after (o). These forms are Doric as well as Attic; the softer Doric however sometimes allows the second sound to drop altogether: as $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\delta\epsilon\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$, not $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\delta\eta\nu$; $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ³, a form, by the way, which was retained by the Argives and Cretans; and many others. In all these the sense of the original length of the last syllable was kept up by not letting the accent be thrown back. The Lesbian sometimes employs a peculiar change of its own, by which ι appears instead of υ , as $\omicron + \nu\tau = \omicron\iota$ in $\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$, &c.⁴. This and parallel forms, $\pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\alpha$, $\text{Μοῖ}\sigma\alpha$, &c., are very common in the fragments of Alcaeus and Sappho, and are also found in Pindar. It certainly cannot be assumed in these that the ι is weakened from the ordinary υ , if that υ be nothing but a glide: such glides are too short in their pronunciation to be capable of corruption. The ι therefore must be explained as a glide which sprang up immediately after the \omicron in Aeolic: and so it is parallel to the forms $\theta\nu\acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$, &c., which have been explained above⁵. The Boeotian in general has ω in these cases, like the severe Doric; both when two vowels are contracted and when a consonant is lost. The ten-

¹ Ahrens, II. 318.

² This is Mr Roby's explanation, preface, p. lxvii.

³ Theok. IV. 8, V. 109.

⁴ Theok. XXVIII. 11.

⁵ At page 251.

CH. VII.

dency of this dialect to single vowel sounds is very remarkable: the only exception is the use of *ei* instead of the ordinary *η*; the tendency toward the particular vowel *ι* reminds us both of the Latin, and also of the extraordinary fondness for that sound shewn in modern Greek. In this love for the monophthong the hard Doric stands next to the Boeotian, and the soft Doric next. The Attic has much more of the diphthong, however the second element was sounded. The Lesbian seems to affect glides. Generally the tendency to become monophthongs was greatest in *ei* and *ou*, which is what we should expect on physiological grounds: next to these come *ai* and *av*.

3. *Latin Diphthongs.*

3. *AI=ai*,
ei, oi;
AU=au,
eu, ou.

These, as I have already said, were once as numerous as those of the old Greeks. But at a very early age they dwindled into simple sounds. Their history has been fully traced by Corssen: the account here given will be little more than an epitome of his results. I will take the six diphthongs, *ai, ei, oi, au, eu, ou* in order.

(i) *Latin ai.*

It would appear from inscriptions¹ that *ai* was sometimes retained, sometimes written as *ae*, from the third century B.C. to the latest times: but it was doubtless in every case pronounced as *ae*, whilst the older method of spelling was of use to distinguish the genitive singular² of the first declension, for example, from the nominative plural, which was written with *ae*. This rule however was probably never universal: we find *tabelai datai* (nom. pl.) in the *Epistola de Bacchanalibus*³, B. C. 186, &c. Perhaps the old *ai* may have been retained longer in the root-part of the word than in suffixes or prepositions; thus we find *aides* and *aidilis* in the well-known epitaph on L. Scipio,

¹ *Ausspr.* I. 680, &c.

² The old termination of this case seems to have been *āyas*; whence *āis*. Then if the *s* were retained, the *a* absorbed the *i*, as in *familiās*. Corssen however gives examples of *āes*, all being female proper names (i. 184). See Schleicher, *Comp.* p. 558.

³ Mommsen, *Corpus Inscriptionum*, Vol. i. No. 196.

son of Barbatus, whilst on the Columna Rostrata of Duilius¹ we find *prae-sens* and *praeda* (i.e. *prae-hid-a*—the same base as *pre-he-(n)d-o*). In the letter however of the consuls forbidding the Bacchic rites (quoted above), we have *aedes*, and *aiguom*. Clearly no fixed rule for the spelling can be given. Corssen however observes that in legal notices from the time of Gracchus to Caesar *ae* is found universally instead of *ai*: after which time *ai* began to reappear: one result, we may suppose, of that restoration of archaic forms of which we have a specimen in Claudius' attempt to remodel the alphabet². That the pronunciation of the diphthong was not unlike the German *ä* or (*a*) is shewn by the fact that it began by degrees to be written as *e*. It was so pronounced by countrymen³ in the time of Lucilius, as we find from Varro⁴ who quotes the forms *Cecilius* and *pretor*: while educated men preserved something of the double sound. In inscriptions after the Christian era *e* appears with increasing frequency: and an inscription dating 242 A.D.⁵ presents the three words *Aimilius*, *Sabinae* and *Furie*. It is quite certain that at that time no distinction would be made between *ai* and *ae*: indeed the former had been replaced in the Latin alphabet only by an affectation of archaic forms; it appears at the same date, or even earlier, upon inscriptions instead of an *e*, which is etymologically correct; but it is possible that even then *ae* may have been rather nearer to *a* than *e* was. Mr Roby thinks that the sound may have been nearer to our (*ä*) in "hat," but pronounced long: with us it is always short. It has been already mentioned that both *ae* and *ě* correspond to open *e* in modern Italian. This would agree with Mr Roby's view: but the closeness of the correspondence would point to a sound for *ae* even nearer to open *e*, that of (*ě*) pronounced long, as in Scotch "ell:" (*ě*) short is heard in English "ell."

¹ *Ib.* No. 195.³ Corssen, *ib.* p. 689.⁵ *Id.* p. 691.² Tac. *Ann.* xi. 13.⁴ *L. L.* vii. 95.

CH. VII.

Not uncommonly *ai* was also weakened to *i*. This takes place especially in case-endings, as *uiis* from *uia-is*, &c.; also in *prae* when in composition, as *priua-tus*, *pri-mus*, *pri-die*, *priuignus* (for *prai-ui-genus*), &c.; and generally in compound words, as *occido* from *caedo*, *iniquos* from *aequos*, *inquiero* from *quaero*. The middle form is sometimes retained, e.g. *exaestumo*¹, *pertaesus* regularly.

(ii) Latin
ei.

In like manner the diphthong *ei* would seem to have lost its double sound at the earliest times of which we have any knowledge. When it occurs in root-syllables, as in *deiu-o-s*, *leib-er*, *deic-o*, *ei-re*, &c. (all of which are found as common forms in the oldest inscriptions), it arises from vowel-intensification, and must be presumed to have been, when thus consciously employed, a true diphthong. But from the very earliest date we find in inscriptions a simple *i* instead of *ei*. Thus in the epitaph², quoted above, of L. Scipio, the "*unus bonorum optumus*," we find *filios*, not *feilios*: in the *Ep. de Bacchanalibus* (also referred to before) we find *scriptum* (though *screiptus* occurs in many later inscriptions) by the side of *deicerent* and *inceideretis*: *primos* on the Col. Rostrata³, though *preimos* (from *praimos*) is much commoner⁴. On the other hand, we know from Varro and Quintilian that as early as the lifetime of the former the country people used *e* where we find *i* in classical Latin. Thus they said *uella* and *speca*, not *uilla* and *spica*: *leber* instead of *liber*⁵. There is every reason to suppose that this pronunciation is still older: *leber* would not be taken from *liber*, the form of spelling then becoming commonest, but from *leiber*: and if this *e* be as old as the *i* we find in inscriptions—for which supposition further reason will appear below—then undoubtedly at the time of the First Punic war *ei* can have been no longer a diphthong, but (as Corssen supposes) a middle-sound, between *e* and *i*, that sound of which Quintilian

¹ Plaut. *Merc.* 566.³ *Ibid.* 196.⁵ Quint. i. 4. 17.² Mommsen, *Inscr.* 32.⁴ Corssen, i. 780.

(speaking of his own time) says, "neque e plane neque i auditur¹." It is not very easy, it must be confessed, to imagine what the mixed sound was, for which we have this testimony of Quintilian. It cannot have been (a) followed by the *i*-glide: for here the *e*-sound is certainly predominant. It would seem that it must have been nearer to the ideal diphthong, a combination in which the two sounds are in perfect balance: such an adjustment is more possible for *ei* than for any other diphthong: the powers of the two letters are more nearly equal than those of any other two.

How old this wavering between *e* and *i* is in Latin may be seen from the inscriptions in places where there is no vowel-intensification, no *ei* to be taken as a common origin, in the verb- and case-endings. Thus, for example, in the epitaph of Scipio alone we find *fuet* and *dedet* by the side of *cepit*: *fuit* and *cepit* occur in the epitaph of his father Barbatus: *cepit* and others on the Columna Rostrata. Besides these, but only in later inscriptions, so far as I am aware, we find forms in *ei*, as *gesistei* in the epitaph² of Scipio the Flamen Dialis, and *venieit* in the lex Thoria³. Now this *ei* cannot denote anything but a wavering sound between *e* and *i*—the former the common sound in the mouths of common men—the latter becoming fixed by literary use: and the fact of this symbol being thus employed at a comparatively early period seems to me to shew that it must some time before have lost the double sound which it originally possessed, at least when it arose from vowel-intensification. The wavering between *e* and *i* is exactly analogous to the Greek variation, which we have seen above⁴.

¹ *Ib.* i. 4. 8.

² Mommsen, No. 33.

³ *Ib.* No. 200.

⁴ *ei* is sometimes found in Plautine MSS. and is then retained by Ritschl, e.g. *Merc.* 409, *veis* (for *vis* from *volo*); *curabeis* (*id.* 526); *abei* (*id.* 748). These manuscripts however have suffered too much from copyists to be accepted of their own weight as trustworthy evidence of archaic forms; they may however confirm the surer indications given by inscriptions. (See Corssen, i. 207.)

CH. VII.

It is noticeable that *ei* is found as a middle step between *ai* and *i*, e.g. in the dat. plur. of the *a*-declension, *incoleis* for *incola-is*; *tabuleis* in the lex Agraria of Thorius mentioned above. It occurs also much more commonly as a weakening from *oi*: thus *plourume* is found in the epitaph of L. Scipio—a weakened form of the nom. plur. *plourumo-is*, still further weakened in the classical *plurim(e)i*. The final *s* of the nom. plur. is found in *eeis* (*Ep. de Bacch.*), i.e. *eo-is*—in classical Latin *ii*: and how easily this *ei* passed into *e* is seen in the *ques* (= *qui*, nom. plur.) of the same inscription—which also contains *eiis* as a dat. plur.: and the Columna Rostrata has *castreis* for *castro-is*. Analogous to the plural *queis* and *ques* are the singular *quoi*, *quei* on the tomb of Barbatus¹, classical *qui*: I do not know that *que* occurs: but for *ho-i-c* we have the classical *hic* and the common *hec*, both found on the tomb of L. Scipio. Ritschl retains in Plautus the locative forms *herei* (*Mil. Glor.* 59) and *die septimei* (*Pers.* 260): but *die crastini* (after the MSS.) in *Most.* 881.

It seems probable then that *ei* was a middle sound between *e* and *i*: that in the oldest times of which we have any record it inclined rather towards *e*, and continued to do so always in the mouths of the common people: from whom it passed into the Romance dialects: whereas the literary dialect substituted *i* for it.

(iii) *Latin*
oi.

The history of the diphthong *oi* in Latin is at first the same as that of *ai*. It early passed into *oe*, being pronounced so probably as early as the First Punic war, at which date we find *Poenicas* on the Columna Rostrata².

¹ Mommsen, 80. It is wrongly written *qui* by Donaldson in the *Varronianus* (p. 261): where however a very useful collection of inscriptions and other records is given. A still better one is given by Roby, *Grammar*, Vol. I. App. B.

² The authority of this inscription is doubtful. It seems clear that it was not engraved as it now stands till the time of the empire; and it is questionable whether it was then faithfully copied from some older column (as Quintilian seems to have thought) or whether (as Mommsen thinks on internal grounds) it was the work of a "grammaticus aetatis Claudianae." See the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, p. 40.

But the old spelling was retained generally. We have no other in the old epitaphs, e.g. that of L. Scipio, which begins—*Honc oino' ploirume, &c.* *Oe* occurs regularly first in the *lex Thoria* (B.C. 111), e.g. *foedere* against *foideratei* of the *Ep. de Bacch.*, and it is regularly used in the laws given by Cicero, *De Legibus*, thus *oenus, ploera, coerator, &c.* [The case-endings also early suffered the same change, as evidenced by the well-known *pilumnœ poploë* (nom. plur.) of the Salian hymn.] But a further alteration of this diphthong had begun as early as the *lex Thoria*, in which we find *unus, procurare, &c.*; *plures* and *curator* in the *De Legibus*. Shortly after the beginning of the first century B.C. this wavering ceased, and *u* appears as the regular representative of the diphthong. Corssen¹ gives the process thus—*oi, oe, ö, ü, u*: the stage *ü* he thinks proved by the transliteration of some Greek words into *oe*, as *Hoelas*: *ü*=Greek *υ*: the full *u* was established, he believes, in the Augustan age. But it is not at all easy to see why *ü* should have become *u*. A simpler passage may have been effected thus—*oi, ui, u*; the *i* acting on the *o* so far as to convert it into the *u*, which was nearer to itself. Or *oe* may conceivably have passed directly into *u*: it is the one intermediate sound between *o* and *e*. In Greek there is the analogy of the transition of *oi* into *υ* in Boeotian, but *u* and *υ* were different sounds.

oi is also weakened to *i* and *e* from very old times in case-endings, e.g. *Barbatî* (gen. sing.) and *plorume* (nom. plur.) on the epitaph of L. Scipio. In both these cases a middle step *ei* is probable². The same change may have taken place in radical syllables, e.g. *uicus* (by the side of *oikos*) and *pomerium* for *pomoerium*³. The change to *i* in the terminations seems to shew an intentional dwelling on the last sound of the diphthong, for sake of emphasis.

Whilst *oi* and *oe* were sounded at all they were probably always diphthongs. This is shewn indirectly by the

¹ I. 201.² See p. 264.³ Corssen, I. 707.

CH. VII.

fact that they were not kept for the case-suffixes of the *o*-stem nouns, e.g. *filio-i*, as *ai* and *ae* were kept for the *a*-stem nouns, *aqua-i* or *aquae*. It is difficult to see in what way they should have passed into the full *u*, if they had been, as they are sometimes supposed to have been, the German *oe* or *ö*¹. The nearest sound we have is perhaps that of "boy." But in all words there must have been a tendency to *ö*.

(iv) *Latin*
au.

AU is the only diphthong which the Latin language has preserved, that is, in the generality of cases; for here also we find a weakening—to *o*—common in early times. It is observable however that the new form in *o* never drove out the old one in *au*, but the two remained side by side. Thus we find *aula* weakened to *olla*, *lautus* to *lotus*, *plaustrum* to *plostrum*: among proper names we find *Clo-dius* by *Claudius*, *Plotus* by *Plantus*. It does not however appear that the Romans availed themselves generally of these double forms (as the Greeks would have done in their place) to denote different modifications of the original idea. Differences indeed in proper names naturally lent themselves to distinguish different branches of the same family: in some few other words also a change of meaning is perceptible: thus *lotus* was restricted to the original idea "washed," while *lautus* expressed the result of the washing, with many minute shades of meaning. But *aula* and *olla* do not seem to have denoted different kinds of pots, or *plaustrum* and *plostrum* different shapes of carts: and the same is true in most other cases. We must then conclude that the different forms were used by different classes of people, and Corssen supposes² that *au* was employed by educated men in words where *o* was heard in the mouth of the countryman: the sound of *au* being the same as that of Greek *av*, which it regularly represents, and by which it is represented, that is, a pure *a*, followed by the *u*-glide. This is borne out by the anecdote of Suetonius about Vespasian, which Corssen quotes. The homely Em-

¹ See Curt, *Erläut.* p. 26.

² I. 659.

peror was taken to task by the courtier Florus, for calling a *plaustrum* a *plostrum*: and retaliated next day by pronouncing his critic's name as befitted ears so polite—*Flavrus*. Naturally this distinction between the two sounds had this effect, that some words in which *o* was the original vowel—not merely a vulgar corruption—began to be spelt with *au* in the literary dialect. An example is *ausculari* (as in Plaut. *Merc.* 575, ed. Ritschl, and many other places). Here there can be no doubt that *osculari* is the true form: *ostium* and other words, derived from the same base *os*, are never spelt with *au*. But *ausculari* became the received form—perhaps on the false analogy of *auscultare*—to give a fashionable colour to so common a proceeding. Sometimes a false derivation may have helped to bring about the same result—or may itself have been only the result of the new spelling—as in *aurichalcum*, a word borrowed from the Greek *ὀρείχαλκος*, and originally written with an *o*¹.

The diphthong passes regularly in classical Latin into *o* in composition. Thus we have *suffoco* (base *fauc*), *explodo* (base *plaud*). Sometimes it passes into *u*, as *accuso* (base *causa*), *defrudo* (base *fraud*). Indeed even *frudavi* (compare *frus-tra*) occurs², and this form, together with *cludo*, the proper name *Clusius*, and others, seems to shew that the change was not confined to compounds³.

Somewhat analogous to the change of sound from *au* to *o* in Latin is the pronunciation of *au* in French—and in some parts of the North of England “law” is pronounced like *lo*. The common pronunciation of *au* in English is a weakening of another kind.

The diphthong *eu* occurs very rarely in Latin; it was regularly weakened to long *u*. The few examples—mostly proper names—where it occurs are in inscriptions, and have been mentioned⁴ in the account of Vowel-Intensification. There are a few occasions in which *eu* occurs in

(v) *Latin eu.*

¹ Corssen, I. 659.

² Plaut. *Trin.* 413.

³ Corssen, I. 661.

⁴ See page 203.

compounds, as *neu* from *ne-ue*, *seu* from *se-ue*, *neuter* from *ne-uter*, and some others. The two vowels should probably be sounded as distinctly as possible; but when sounded quickly they must have had a tendency (like the Greek *eu*) to pass into a sound like ours, that is, our *u*-sound = (yoo). *Neūtiqum* is short in Terence; perhaps the *e* was elided. Similar variations occur in English; "duty" is commonly pronounced *dyooty*, but sometimes *dooty*.

(vi) *Latin*
ou.

The last diphthong has passed through much the same history as *eu*, except that it lingered later in use. It is often found in the old inscriptions: *Loucana* is on the tomb of Barbatus, *plous* and *ioubeatis* in the letter concerning the Bacchanalia, *iouranto* in the Bantine table. *U* begins to appear in the inscriptions of the age of the Gracchi¹. Thus in the lex Thoria *iubeo* and *ioubeo* occur indifferently; *iudex* and *ioudex*; *iuro* and *iouro*. Sometimes the *o* drove out the *u*, which in such cases had probably become a glide: but after this success it always sank into *u* at a very early period: thus *poplicus* occurs frequently in inscriptions, beginning with the *Ep. de Bacch.*, passing in the lex agraria Thoria into *publicus*. Similarly we find *nountios*, *nontiatius*, *nuntius*: and *noundinum* (contracted from *nouendinum*) in the *Ep. de Bacch.*, *nondinum* in the Tab. Bant., and the common *nundinum*². Sometimes the *o* weakened itself into *u*: so that the diphthong passed through the stages *ou*, *uu*, and then *u* as before. Thus *souos*, which occurs in the beautiful epitaph of Claudia, quoted by Mommsen³, passed to *suuos*, and that to *suos* and *suus*. So also occur *flouios*, *fluuios*, and *flu-ere*.

Roby⁴ assigns to *ou* the sound of "Southern English" *ō*, a diphthong formed of *o* and *u*. He probably means

¹ *Lucios* on the tombs of Barbatus and his son, which Corssen gives as examples of the weakening at a still earlier period, is more probably from *Leucios*.

² Corssen, I. 670.

³ *Rom. Hist.* I. p. 60, Eng. trans.

Souom mareitom corde deilexit souo.

⁴ *Grammar*, p. 81.

the *o* with a *u*-glide. But in this case I should have expected the Latin diphthong to have passed into *o* rather than into *u*: but it does pass into *u* most regularly. I therefore think that its sound was probably very near *u*, like the Greek *ov*.

The following table gives the results of our discussion of the probable sound of the diphthongs: the new sounds being those to which the Greek and Latin languages were respectively tending. The English equivalents are given, as before, in brackets, as nearly as possible.

Orig.	Diphthongal sound	In Greek	In Latin
ai	as in "aye"	tending to (a)	tending to (a) or (ee)
ei	„ "grey"	„ (a) or (ee)	„ (a) or (ee)
oi	„ "boy"	„ ö, ti and (ee)	„ ö or (oo)
au	„ "how"	same	„ (o)
eu	„ "yew" (?)	same	„ (oo)
ou	„ "grow"	„ (oo)	„ (oo)

4. Weakening of *U* in Greek.

The full *u* of the Graeco-Italian was retained by the Latin peoples, but weakened by the Greeks perhaps to the sound of the German *ü*. This is shewn, first by the fact that when the Greeks transliterated the Roman *u*, they employed not *v* but *ov*, which, as we have already seen, approached very nearly, if not quite, to *u*: secondly, and more conclusively, by the variation of practice amongst the Romans in transliterating Greek words. In the early time of Roman intercourse with Greece, they were content to employ the best equivalents for Greek sounds which their language afforded; accordingly they employed *u* to denote *v*, as in *Burrus*, i.e. *Pyrrhus*. But in the last

4. *U*=*u*-*psilon*.

century of the Republic, when the respect of the Romans for Greek literature had greatly increased, they were not content with this rough and inexact representation: and therefore they borrowed the symbol Υ as well as the sound. I do not know that any authority before Cicero mentions this borrowing: it dated from his lifetime. The sound of υ is not known with exactness; but it is certainly a modified u , and cannot have differed greatly from the German ue or $ü$, that is, as we have seen, a sound between i and u , having a front position of the tongue, like i , but rounded like u . In modern Greek this modified u -sound has been further changed into the i -sound¹. Only one Greek people, the Boeotians, retained the full sound in its original place, i.e. in those words whose corresponding forms in other dialects are spelt with υ ; but even they denote that sound by the symbol $\sigma\upsilon$, like the other Greeks. Thus they wrote $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ for $\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\upsilon}$, but the quantities are not different; so that the sound of $\sigma\upsilon$, in Boeotia at least, cannot then have been double. In inscriptions we find $\alpha\sigma\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\chi\alpha$ (i.e. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$), $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu$, and $\sigma\omicron\upsilon\gamma\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega\varsigma$, $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ²; these are all Theban; $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\upsilon\chi$, Κουζικηνός , Μουρίνα are on a list of victors at the Χαριτεΐσια from Orchomenos³; but in the next inscription of the same class and from the same place, we have the usual forms; Boeckh dates it Ol. 145. As a rule, the full peculiarities are found only in Theban inscriptions⁴. In fragments of Corinna we have $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ and $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ (i.e. $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$) $\theta\omicron\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota\rho$,

¹ That this change had not taken place in the ninth or tenth century of our era, seems probable from the Anglo-Saxon transliteration already mentioned. In this y is always used for υ , and i for e , without any confusion, such as is found e.g. in the transliteration of η , for which sound the Anglo-Saxon had probably no exact counterpart. That the scribe meant to express the corresponding sounds of the two languages, not merely to give corresponding symbols, is clear from his transliteration of the diphthong $\alpha\iota$ by y . See Prof. Hadley (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1872).

² *C. I. G.* 1562, 1563, 1569 a, 1573.

³ *Ib.* 1583.

⁴ In Oropian inscriptions the υ is found constantly, no doubt because of the close connection of the place with Attica: e.g. $\delta\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\sigma\eta\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ &c. in 1566 and 1569 c. The same explanation however will hardly apply to those of Lebadea, where we have $\Pi\upsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ (1571), Ὀλύμπιος (1575), or to those of Orchomenos (1579, 1580, &c.).

ὀνφιβίλας, ἀνούμηνεν, τοῦ (which in common Boeotian is τοῦν) identical in sound as in meaning with Latin *tu*.

According to Hesychius the full *u* was kept in Laconia also: he gives *κάπουα*, *οὔδραίνω*, and others. But there is no appearance of it upon inscriptions; neither is it found in the fragments of Alkman. Probably, therefore, Hesychius confused Boeotian with Laconian forms: the two dialects have much in common in detail, but not very much in principle.

This weaker *u* differs from the full one, not in any alteration of the action of the lips, but from a different position of the tongue, which is allowed to come further forward in the mouth: the variation therefore is in the direction which all simply weakened articulation takes. The same vowel is much affected in many languages as well as in Greek: the French *u* is a parallel example; in *une*, according to Mr Bell, the vowel is a mid-front-wide-round: that is, the tongue is more nearly in the position for *e*, about half way between that for *u* (original) and that for *ü*: in *un* he thinks that the vowel is not rounded at all, i.e. there is no motion of the lips, but the point of the tongue acts as well as the back¹.

In England also *u* has lost its true character in the great majority of words in which it occurs, e.g. in *but*, *shut*: there is no rounding of the lips at all: the vowel differs from the French in the simpler position of the tongue: the back of it only is called into use, not the point. This weakening indeed is principally confined to the south; Cumberland is still pronounced by natives with the full vowel sound which we denote by *oo*: the tendency however (as is always the case) is progressive: it is not long since Russia and Prussia were called in England Roossia and Proossia: and already we sometimes hear *put* pronounced like *but*.

Parallel
affections
of *u* in
other lan-
guages.

¹ Technically, it is a "mid-mixed-primary" vowel, like that of *que* (Fr.). See pages 91—93.

CH. VII.

5. Further (sporadic) Vowel-substitution in Greek.

5. Sporadic change in Greek.

We have seen that in Greek the original *a* is regularly broken up into *a*, *ε*, and *ο*; and that *u* is weakened into *υ* or *ü*. The sound of the original *i* remained unaltered. Beyond this there was little variation in the main body of the Greek language. A vowel of one scale never *regularly* passed into one of another scale. This took place sometimes irregularly, and generally in one only of the head-dialects: most commonly in the Aeolic. But, if we except perhaps the Boeotian, this change never became so general as to deserve the name of a phonetic law, even for one dialect. For example, the weakening of *a* into *υ* is most commonly found in the Aeolic: thus in Lesbian *ἀπό* becomes *ἀρύ*: yet that same Lesbian retains the *a* in words where the other dialects have suffered it to sink as far at least as the intermediate *ο*: thus *ῥά* is the Aeolic form of *ῥό*¹. The change therefore cannot be said to be peculiar to any one dialect: nor yet to any class of words: sometimes, but not generally, it is explicable as produced by the influence of adjoining sounds. It is essentially *sporadic*—and as such, to be carefully distinguished from those *regular* vowel-changes mentioned above, which have passed so generally over all the dialects, that they must be regarded as being among the characteristic marks which distinguish the Greek from its sister languages.

I shall give the more important of the small list of words in which the Greek has suffered original *a* to pass into *ι* or *υ*².

(i) Weakening of *a* to *ι*.(i) *A* = .

This will be found in most cases to have been helped by an intermediate *ε*, which is kept in some forms of the

¹ Sappho, *Frag.* i. 9, &c.² More examples (not very certain ones) may be found in Curtius (*Gr. Et.* 663—671, &c.), Leo Meyer (*Vergl. Gram.* i. 115, &c.), and in Ahren's two volumes (*passim*).

word. Thus in ἐνίπτω for ἐν-**ῑ**π-τω the *a* of the original VAK is weakened to *ι*. But the gap is bridged by the form (F)ἐπ-ος¹. The same may be said of ἴσθι (√*es*) beside ἔστω, χθιζός beside χθές, ἱπνός perhaps beside ἔψω: σκίπων, a staff, and probably σκίμπος, a couch, are from SKAP; and the Latin *Scipio* (perhaps for *Scimpio*) shews the same change: σκήπτω and σκήπων give the middle step. The analogous form σκήπων explains also why *Scipio* becomes Σκηπίων in Plutarch: that form cannot therefore be fairly used (as it has sometimes been) to prove that *η* in classical times had an *i*-sound. In other cases the Latin has preserved a Graeco-Italian *e* which has passed into *ι* in the Greek: as in *equos* by ἵππος, Sanskrit *aṅva*, where the original *a* is seen. In πέντε, beside *quinque*, the Greek has the older form of the vowel, though not of the consonants. It will be observed in most of these cases that the weakened vowel precedes two consonants: as also in κίρ-νη-μι (√*ker*), πít-νω, which retains in the 2 aor. ἔπесου the original vowel of √*pet*, and in many others. Here the word was sufficiently strengthened by the combination of consonants to allow a weakening of the radical vowel. Perhaps a further reason is found in other verbs, such as πίπτω, γίγνομαι, &c.; here the original forms were πιπέτω and γυγένομαι: the *ι*, which seems radical in the contracted forms, is really the vowel of a reduplicated syllable; the pronunciation may have been weakened as its origin became less distinctly felt. In ἴζω (beside ἔδος, root SED) we have either simple weakening or a contracted reduplicated form σι-σεδ-γω: we may compare the Latin *sīdo* apparently for *si-sed-o*, and *nīdus* for *ni-sed-us*; at least the *d* of the identical Sanskrit *nīḍa* is only expli-

¹ This intermediate step is not however found in Sanskrit: where (in default of any *ē*) many common words have the original *a* weakened at once to *i*, as *pitar* (father); *duhitar* (θυγατερ): *niṣā*, 'if this, as well as *nakta*=noct-, *vukr*-, Gothic *nahts*, A. S. *niht*, our "night." If so, the Sanskrit and the Greek shew different changes; the English old pronunciation, *neet*, still heard in the North, agrees with the Sanskrit. But Prof. Benfey connects *niṣā* with *ni-ṣi* (√*ki* in *keimai*) as "lying-down" time; which is very probable.

cable by supposing a lost *s*: I think therefore that ἴζω is probably a contracted form. But in ἰδρύω (beside ἔδρα) simple weakening is more probable. Sometimes the radical syllable itself has suffered, as in ἀτ-ιτ-άλλω, ὀπ-ιπ-εύω, and ὀν-ίν-η-μι. In verbs where the reduplication retained some of its significance the *ι* became at last the formal vowel of reduplication, as in τί-θη-μι, δί-δω-μι, &c. This origin of *ι* is probable, though not very recognisable, for ἴημι (i.e. γι-γα-μι): if so, it is a causal verb formed from ΥΑ, to go. On the same principle the difficult verb ἰαύω has been taken for a reduplicated form of ΒΑΣ = to dwell; and, undoubtedly, resting in the same place is the primary idea of the verb, which came to mean "sleep" afterwards¹, but I do not understand the form. Again, ἰάλλω may be *ι*-αλ-γω, perhaps from ΑΡ (Sanskrit √*ṛi* = to go): and ἰ-αχεῖν would come in the same way from ἀχεῖν (ἡχεῖν). All these however are very uncertain. Long *ι* from *α* is seen in πίνω.

More examples of this weakening are to be found in the other dialects. In Hesiod, in the Odyssey and in the soft Doric of Sicily we have ἰστίη and ἰστία for ἑστία, where the Graeco-Italian *e* is warranted by the Latin *Vesta*: it also takes *ι*, rather than *ε*, as a substitute for *γ*, as ἀργύριος, φοινίκιος in Epicharmus, ῥστίων in Theokritus². The Cretan θιός and Laconian σιός³ for θεός are the only certain examples in hard Doric. The Lesbian division of the Aeolic shews little more the substitution of *ι* for *ε* instead of *γ* mentioned in the soft Doric, as σιδάριος⁴, πορφύριος⁵, &c.: πίσυρες is certainly Ionic, but cannot be proved to be Lesbian. But in Boeotian the change to *ι* is very extensive: the set of the dialect is to this vowel, just as in modern Greek⁶, in which η, υ, ει, οι and υι have

¹ λαύειν πόδα (Phoen. 1538) can clearly have nothing to do with sleep.

² 2, 21, 62, and 90; 4, 16.

³ Ar. Lys. 11, 174: Thuc. 5. 81.

⁴ Theok. 29, 24.

⁵ Sappho, 13.

⁶ See for the change in modern Greek, Geldart's *Modern Greek Language* in the Clarendon Press Series, which I have found very useful,

all sunk to the ι -sound (ee). Thus we have $\theta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (probably not $\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, the form which occurs in Aristophanes¹: the inscriptions all agree in having θ , and the word occurs very frequently: θ too is a letter for which the Boeotian has a decided preference; thus we find $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\theta\iota$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\iota$; and τ does not pass into σ before another τ , e.g. we have $\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega$ ² ($\sqrt{\text{Fid}}$), not $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega$; there is therefore no tendency to assibilation): $\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ (= $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$) are very common: $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\iota\alpha\nu$ ³ is $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$) apparently: ι takes the place of ϵ in contract verbs, as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$ ⁴, $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\omega$, &c.; $\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\theta\iota$ ⁵ is for $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\tau\iota$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\iota$, Attic $\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota$), &c. It is not indeed probable that the ϵ -sound was at any time absolutely lost in Boeotia: it is found even in Theban inscriptions, and still more in those of the other towns, which, as we have already seen, agreed with the speech of ordinary Greece in many points where Thebes differed. Still the tendency to ι was a very strong one.

(ii) *Weakening of a to v.*

As between a and ι an intermediate ϵ could generally be found, so here also a passes into v commonly through o . Thus *nakt* (already mentioned) passed into Graeco-Italian *noct*- and here the Latin stopped: but the Greeks went on to *νυκτ*-. The same is true of *mola*, Greek $\mu\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta$: $\sigma\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ seems to be a weakening if compared with *sportula*: the original a is kept in $\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu$, a rope. The Graeco-Italian *com* becomes $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ or $\xi\upsilon\nu$; the Sanskrit has *sam*: perhaps there was an original form *skam*. Sometimes however there is no sign of any intermediate o . Thus we have $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, which is apparently the same as Sanskrit *chakra*: and $\omicron\nu\nu\chi$ is the Sanskrit *nakha*, our "nail," and occasionally we have both the a and v within the Greek itself; as in $\beta\upsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ beside $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$, and $\kappa\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\delta\omega$ is more frequent than though I cannot at all agree with the author in the importance which he assigns to modern Greek as a guide to the pronunciation of the old.

¹ Ach. 906.

² Ach. 860.

³ C. I. G. 1588.

⁴ So in 1583, but not regularly, see 1576 and others.

⁵ Ib. 1569 a.

CH. VII.

καλινδέω: σκύφος = a can, in the Odyssey¹, seems akin to σκάφος. The name Ἐφύρα—which was once that of Corinth, but also of many other places—is clearly the “look-out place” from √Φορ: but the *υ* here may be partly due to the lost *υ*. Σίσυφος and ζέφυρος seem to shew a similar change, but their derivation is not clear. It will be observed that in a great number of these words the change may be ascribed to a neighbouring liquid or nasal. These consonants modify vowels more than any others; they resemble vowels themselves, though in different ways: consequently when the organs are put into the position required for some one of them, there is a strong tendency to sound beside it that vowel which has the nearest position to it. We shall see much more of this influence exercised by consonants in Latin; it is regular there, but quite sporadic in Greek. We have already seen that in some roots *a* passes into *u* before *r* or *l*: e.g. SPAR becomes SPUR or SPUL. We find *υ* instead of *ο* in a small group of common names, which is rather curious, though in each case the change may be accounted for by the reason already given: there are πρύτανις, the Attic magistrate, which is doubtless derived from πρό: αἰσυνήτης, the umpire—one who is “mindful of the fit” (αἴσα and √μνα), in later times an elective magistrate: ἄγυρις and πανήγυρις, the solemn assembly: no one of these words seems to have been confined to any particular dialect: they are all doubtless instances of consonantal assimilation. So also πύματος is akin to Latin *pos*, *po(s)ne*: and πρύμνη, like πρύτανις, must be akin to πρό. Sometimes the change is seen in the suffix *-tar*, the Graeco-Italian *τορ*: as in μάρτυρ. Curtius compares the weakening in the corresponding Italian words, e.g. *dator*, *daturus*.

But it is the Lesbian dialect which shews this change most fully. Just as the Boeotian inclined towards *ι*, so this dialect inclined to *υ*. In each the change, sporadic in the rest of Greece, was so extensive, as to

¹ xiv. 112.

almost deserve the title of regular. In Lesbian we find *στύμα*, *ὑμοιοι*¹, *τυῖδε*² (i.e. *τοιδε* = thither, Attic *τῆδε*), *ξύανον* for *ξύανον*, *ὑμαλος* for *όμαλός*, *ἀπύ* both alone, and in compounds as *ἀπύγονος* (compare the Arcadian *κατύ*), &c.³ The adverbs *ἄμυδις* and *ἄλλυδις* seem to be Ionic as well as Lesbian. *ῥνυμα* is vouched for by grammarians, but does not occur. But the compounds *εὐώνυμος*, *νώνυμος*, &c. are general. This change is the furthest limit of the tendency which we have already seen in the Lesbian to change *a* to *o*. It was however probably not so extensive as the change from *a* to *i* in Boeotian.

(iii) *Weakening of v to i.*

This, though not at all an unnatural change, is not common in Greek. From *√φv* we have *ὑπερφίαλος*: compare *ὑπερ-φv-ής* and the Latin *super-bus*, where the *b* corresponds regularly to *φ* as the representative of original *bh*: *σίαλος* seems to come from *σῦ-ς*. *φίτυς* and *φιτύω* must certainly be referred to *√φv*. In *ψιθυρός* from *ψύθος* we have apparently dissimilation, caused by the *v* of the suffix: *μῖσος* and *μύσος* are probably not akin. The grammarians give *ἰπέρ*, *ἱπαρ*, *ἱψος*, *ἱψηλος* as Aeolic: the last does occur in Sappho⁴: but there is no more evidence for any of them: and they do not occur even in Boeotian, which had much more tendency to the *i*-sound. The change can be regarded as only a distant indication of the passage into *i* which became general at a much later period, according to Curtius not before the eleventh century⁵. The rarity of it deserves notice when we estimate the value of modern Greek pronunciation as a guide to the sounds of the older language.

(iii) *U = i.*

¹ Theok. xxix. 25 and 20.

² Id. xxviii. 5.

³ Ahrens, i. 81, &c.

⁴ Frag. 119.

⁵ Erläut. p. 22.

6. *Further Vowel-Substitution (Latin).*

*Peculiar
weakness of
the Latin
vowel-
system.*

This has found place in Latin to a much greater extent than in Greek. We have seen above how fully, even down in their most flourishing period of literature, the Greeks had preserved their original store of diphthongs, whilst the Romans at the age of Plautus had retained only one. We have also seen how vividly the distinction remained in the Greek mind of the three different vowel-scales, by the insignificant list of transitions from *a* to *i* or *u*, of which the more important have been given in the preceding section. The same precision must not be looked for in Latin. It has been seen indeed already that a distinction of scales may have been received by the Italians from their forefathers of the Graeco-Italian age: for some of the traces of modification of the vowels, each in its own scale, have been given above. But no such method could possibly be maintained in a language which suffered nearly all its diphthongs to degenerate into single sounds. Indeed the most striking characteristic of the Latin language is the exceeding weakness of its vowel-system. The vowels have no longer any life in them. They are often the mere servants of the consonants to which they cling, and from which they take their tone: never (as in the Greek) do they expel the consonants by their own fuller life and energy¹.

¹ In my first edition I quoted here Corssen's connection of the vowel-degradation with the gradual weakening of the Roman character. This connection was objected to by Prof. Mayor, I think with justice; and I have cancelled it. It is doubtless wrong to argue from a portion only of the phonetic system, whatever light the whole may throw upon the character of a nation. I am not quite sure that Prof. Mayor has escaped the same error; for he goes on to give his own interpretation of the fact. He considers the contempt of vowel-sound to be a mark of the "strength and energy" of the Romans; I really do not see why; and of their "inartistic nature." Did they then restore their lost vowels as they grew more artistic? they went on corrupting them more

The steps of this vowel-degradation have been arranged by Corssen¹ in the following table, which is also given by Dr Donaldson²:

A passes to O	U	E	I,
O passes to U	E	I,	
U passes to E	I,		
E passes to I, U,			
I passes to E.			

From which table we see that while *a* retains its position as the primary vowel, never derived from any other, and while *o* is only derived from *a*, the other vowels *u*, *e*, and *i* are constantly substitutes of stronger sounds, not indeed indifferently, but in accordance with no law of vowel-scales. We shall see hereafter that the decision, which vowel shall be taken, rests generally with the following consonant. The vowel-change does not originate with the consonants: it is caused, as has been already insisted on, by weakness of articulation. But the direction which that change follows does generally rest with the consonants. This will be clearly seen in the section on Assimilation, where I shall describe that vowel-change which arises from weak articulation, but is modified by the affinities between particular vowels and consonants. At present I shall describe such change as is due to simple weakening, where the effect of neighbouring sounds is

than ever. Prof. Mayor also cites "the elaborate vowel-system of the Indians as a mark of the indolent and unpractical life of the dreamy Oriental." But surely the Indian vowel-system is much *less* elaborate than the Greek, and even than the old Latin: they had no *ē* or *ō*, and by consequence form fewer diphthongs; their only gains were distinct symbols for the long original vowels, and also for the so-called vowel-sound of *r* (*i. e.* the glide), all of which sounds the Graeco-Italians doubtless had, though not the symbols. The Sanskrit *ī* existed in the brains of grammarians and perhaps in one verb.

¹ *Auspr.* i. 299, ed. 1. A fuller table exhibiting the results of assimilation as well as substitution is now given by him in his second edition (ii. 334) as follows:

a	to o	to u	to e	to i			
	o (orig. a)	„ u	„ e	„ i			
		u	„ e	„ i	to o		
			e (orig. a)	„ i	„ o	to u	
				i		„ u	to e.

² *Varr.* p. 318.

CH. VII.

Contrast
between the
Greek and
the Latin.

at least not distinctly traceable. As however I have contrasted the vowel-system of the Greek and Latin, I may in passing give a few instances where assimilation has been at work, in order more fully to shew the differing genius of the two languages. They are cases where the Latin has borrowed from the Greek, and has changed the word, after it had become naturalised, to suit its own phonetic laws. They are taken from different parts of Corssen's chapters on "Umlaut".¹ He has treated the subject so fully as to leave little else to be done but to select examples from his stores. From them will be seen how rigid and lifeless, how dependent on neighbouring sounds, is the vocalism of the Latin, as compared with the Greek. Take the five words, *Hecuba*², *crapula*, *cata-pulta*, *tribulus*, *epistula*. The penultimate vowel in each is *u*. But when written in the original language—Ἑκάβη and κραιπάλη, καταπέλτης and ὄβελος, ἐπιστολή—we see three vowels, *a*, *e*, *o*. The reason is, as will be hereafter shewn in the chapter on Assimilation, that a labial and (more especially) *l* have a prevailing tendency in Latin to fix the preceding vowel (when weakened by some other cause) at *u*. Similarly *i* has an affinity to *n*, and *e* to *r*: μηχανή and βαλανεῖον become *machina* and *balineum*; φάλαρα and τέσσαρα become *phalerae* and *tessera*. Indeed, before the suffix *-ro-* hardly any other vowel but *e* is found, as in *libero*, *aspero*, &c. Contrast with this the varied abundance of the Greek καθαρο-, φοβερο-, ἄλμυρο-, πονηρο-, &c.³ When, for ease of utterance, a vowel is inserted between two following consonants of a borrowed Greek word, the vowel is determined by the following consonant. Thus Ennius wrote Πατροκλῆς as *Patri-c-oles*, because in the older language *o* shewed the same affinity to *l* as *u* does afterwards; compare the real Italian *Hercoles* or *Herculus*: but Ἀσκληπίος becomes

¹ II. 60—333.

² There was an older mid-form *Hecoba*: Quint. i. 4. 16.

³ Corssen, II. 199.

Aesculapius: δραχμή and Ἀλκμήνη become *drachuma* and *Alcumena* in Plautus, because of the labial nasal *m*. But μνᾶ and τέχνη become *mina* and *techina*¹, because of the following *n*.

I proceed to give examples of vowel-weakening, independent in the main of assimilating tendencies, under three principal heads—in formative elements (both formative and inflectional suffixes), in composition, and in reduplication.

First, then, in formative elements, we may see in the nom. sing. *o* the Graeco-Italian termination of the base (itself weakened from Indo-Eur. *a*) in classical Latin weakened to *u*. We have *filios Barbati*—with the *o*—on the epitaph of Scipio. This change was complete about the end of the Second Punic war: in the Edict of L. Aemilius (189, B.C.) the *u* instead of *o* is regular². The *o* was retained always in *-ōs* (equivalent, as Corssen thinks, to *ās* with vowel intensified), e.g. *clamos*, *arbos*, *honos*: and the vowel sank no further even when the *s* became *r*. The neuter nom. ended in *os*, like the Greek *genos*, then *genus*: *opos* is found on a statue³, the *o* is still seen in the gen. of many nouns, as *corporis* (for *corpos-is*): though others have weakened it to *e*, as *generis* for *genos-is*. This *os* can also be traced in the case-endings. Thus in the *Ep. de Bacch.* we find *senatu-os* (weakened through *senatus* to classical *senatus*), and *corpor-us*, which speaks of the older *corpos-os*; compare γένεσ-ος afterwards γένους. Both the *Ep. de Bacch.* and the Edict of Aemilius shew also *u* before *m* in the accusatives. That the *u* of the genitive plural is weakened from *o* is shewn by the form *duonoro(m)* = *bonorum* on Scipio's tomb: and the tenacity with which the Italian provincials still clung to this, as to other old vowel-sounds, is shewn, e.g. by the “loro” = *illorum* of modern Italian. As Corssen well says⁴: “the

(i) Weakening of formative syllables.

¹ Plaut. *Capt.* 641.

² Corssen, II. 90. The edict, discovered in 1867, is given in Roby's *Grammar*, p. 419.

³ Corssen, II. 87.

⁴ I. 246 (ed. 1).

peasant of the Roman Campagna at this very day pronounces this genitive-ending as it sounded on the lips of the mighty Romans who twenty-one centuries ago wrote on the tomb of Lucius Cornelius Scipio that he was 'the best of the good.' Yet the tombs of the Scipios, father and son, shew that in written Latin the transition from *o* to *u* was even then taking place: we have *Lucius* on the earlier, but *Luciom* and *uiro(m)* on the later¹. On the whole it would seem that *o* was retained more commonly before final *m*, in the singular acc. and nom. of the neuter and in the gen. plur.: while it gave way sooner to *u* before the case-ending *s* of the nom. sing. But this rule is by no means universal. After *u* the *o* was regularly kept until the time of the Emperors, to avoid the repetition of the same sound. Quintilian says² that he was taught to write *seruos* and *ceruos*, but that, at the time when he wrote, the spelling *seruus* and *ceruus* had come in. It would seem that the educated Roman employed *u* instead of *o* (and similarly *i* instead of *e*) in many cases where the provincial Italians at the same time used only the *e* and *o* which they had received from their forefathers: and this weakening—which however, like the original division of *a* into *a*, *e*, and *o*, materially increased the force and precision of the written Latin—probably dates from about the Second Punic war. The older *e* and *o* are again to be seen in numberless inscriptions of the later Empire, examples of which are given by Corssen, and so passed into the modern Italian and other Romance languages, which (as is now a recognised fact) must be derived, not from the classical Latin, but from the dialects of the provincials.

A curious analogy to this process is pointed out by

¹ On the age however of the epitaph of the elder Scipio, see Corssen, II. 93 note. Ritschl believes it to have been restored at a period later than that of the son's.

² I. 7, 26.

Corssen¹ in the history of the Umbrian. This dialect would seem to have passed through the very same stages centuries earlier than the languages of the rest of the Italian stock. Thus in the oldest Umbrian inscriptions we find *o* corrupted to *u* as much as, and often more than, in classical Latin: we have *puplum* (*populum*) and *kum* (= *con* or *cum*). These date from a time earlier than the conquest of Umbria. But in the so-called New Umbrian—the monuments of which however reach back to a time older than the oldest Latin records—we again find the *o*: as in *poplom* and *com*. And Corssen's hypothesis is probably correct, that the victorious Roman soldier carried with him into Umbria the old pronunciation of the vowels which was heard at Rome long after the subjugation of Italy, and which remained ever after the pronunciation in the conquered district. Corssen however seems to retract this opinion in his second edition. In this he postulates a middle sound between *o* and *u* in all the Italian dialects, except the Latin and Faliscan. His evidence for this sound does not appear to me convincing²: perhaps the strongest piece is the existence of a symbol ∇ in Oscan, which seems to express something slightly differing from *V*, and if so, something in the direction of *o*. This sound, he thinks, was nearer to *o* in the Oscan, nearer to *u* in the Old Umbrian: which however had no separate symbol for the sound as the Oscan had, and denoted it merely by *v*, as being sufficiently near: then at a later period this indistinct sound inclined of itself (not by external influence) more towards *o*, and was so denoted in the later (New) Umbrian inscriptions. But even if we allow this middle sound (which is no doubt curiously supported by the modern Italian close *o*³—the exact middle sound postulated), yet I think that some cause would be necessary to account for the backward movement to a purer *o*: and the influence of the Latin *o* seems just what we want.

¹ I. 249, &c., ed. 1: on the other side, see II. 119—127, ed. 2.

² See II. 94—98.

³ See page 96.

The connecting vowel in the conjugation of verbs has been regularly weakened in Latin from the original and Sanskrit *a* ; e.g. Indo-Eur. *bhar-a-mas*, and Sanskrit *bhard-mas*. It has passed through the Graeco-Italian *o*, where the Greek halts (*φέρ-ο-μεν*), and rarely stays even at *u* (*uolumus*), but passes on to the thin *i*, as in *ferimus*¹. This weakening is doubtless due to the unsubstantial character of the connecting vowel—the mere link between base and termination. Before two consonants, as *-nt*, *-nd*, the vowel has taken a somewhat different course. Traces of the *o* are seen in the *dederont* of inscriptions, and quoted by Quintilian² together with *probaueront* as proofs that the Latin possessed this *o* as well as the Greek: we have *tremonti* in the *Carmen Saliare*, *cosentiont* on the tomb of the younger Lucius Scipio: in Plautus we find *ruont*, *abnuont*, *uiuont*, *loquontur*, &c., and these two forms occur even in Lucretius; the preceding *u* has preserved the *o*. The next step *u* maintains itself in *ferunt*, &c., but passes on, not to *i* but *e* in *ferentem* and *ferendum*. From Corssen's examples it would appear that *o* had become *u* about B.C. 150, in all cases where *u* was permanently retained, an exception being made where *u* precedes the *o*: but the fluctuation between *u* and *e* prevailed from the time of Plautus to the end of the Republic: when the *e* was definitely established, though it never expelled the *u* from legal or other formulae, e.g. *iure dicundo*, *familiae erciscundae*. The *e* in these cases is due to the fact that before two consecutive consonants the vowel sound is deadened, as will be shewn below. Still in some formations (and also in radical syllables) where *o* has been weakened to *u*, the process stops there, e.g. in *hunc*, *uncia*, *homunculus*, *Acheruntem*, *secundus*, *dupundi*; so also the *u* is retained in *alumnus*, *columna*, &c., and in *arbustum* and *arbuscula*, *fustis*, *aplustre*. *E* itself passes into *u* in

¹ The long *a*, *e*, and *i* of the 1st, 2nd, and 4th conjugation respectively result from contraction.

² I. 4, 16.

diurnus for *dies-nus*, comp. *hodiernus* : *r* being a common Latin weakening from *s*. In all these cases Corssen assumes that the *u* is due to the consonant or group of consonants following: and it is quite possible, as we shall see in the next section, that *m* (particularly when in combination with another consonant) might have this effect. But I see no reason for assuming it when *n*, *s*, and *r* are the adjacent consonants.

In final syllables the original vowel commonly sinks to *e*: a fact which Corssen explains by suggesting that though *i* be a thinner vowel, yet *e* is the most suitable for terminations, because in pronouncing it the organs of speech vary the least from their position when in perfect rest¹. Examples will occur at once: thus, *monuere* has sunk from an original *monueront*, through the customary *monuerunt*: then the final *nt* was dropped by that weakness of articulating the final syllable, which is so noticeable in Latin, and which will be more fully discussed afterwards. Either form was in use indifferently in the last century of the Republic, and traces of the weak form are much older. Whether there was an intermediate *i* at one period seems uncertain: Corssen² quotes an isolated *dederi*: which, together with *dedrot* and *dedro*, may serve to shew the great fluctuation of usage. In *utere* for *uteris*, in *utebare*, *uterere*, &c., the loss of *s* has led to the same result. So also in some nominatives of pronouns the final *s* has been dropped, and the vowel, thus left defenceless, has suffered the usual degradation: so *ipse* has an older form *ipsus*, and *ille* is doubly weakened from *ollus*. In the ablative, the loss of *d* has frequently caused a double form, as from *marid*, *mari*, and *mare*; the tendency was always to pass on to *e*, but the necessity of keeping the cases distinct often protected the *i*. In the later times of the Empire the cases become hopelessly confused: the dative—and even the genitive and accusative after losing

¹ II. 221.² I. 70, ed. 1: see II. 203.

their final consonants—could sink into final *e*: thus Corsen¹ quotes *Tebere* for *Tiberim*, and *mare* for *maris*. But to notice all the corruptions of the late Latin, interesting though they be as illustrations of the process which led to the confusion of cases in the Romance languages, is beyond our present plan. In the accusative as well as in the ablative of the *i*-declension in classical Latin we see the affection for *e* in the terminating syllable; the *e* in fact was almost final, for the *m* was hardly sounded. Many words exhibit both forms; thus we have both *navim* and *nauem*, *turrim* and *turrem*, with an increasing preference for the latter form. A few are found only with *i*, as *sitim*, *wim*, and one or two others. Very rarely does the Latin avail itself of the double form to express diversity of meaning; thus *partem* is the regular accusative, while *partim* is used for an adverb, as are a very large number of old accusatives from extinct nouns in *-ti*, as *raptim*, *statim*, &c. The retention of *e* in the nominative of nouns in *en-* (which was originally *an*, and was allowed to sink even to *in* in the other cases), e.g. *nomen*, *stamen*, *pecten*, and very many others, is probably also due to its being the final syllable. The original *a* is kept in Sanskrit *nāma* from base *nāman*. The *e* is kept in further compounds, as *momen-tum*, &c., because followed by two consonants. In *septem*, *nouem*, *decem* the feeling of convenience introduced the *e*; whilst in Greek *ἐπτά*, &c., a recollection of the loss of the nasal kept the final vowel from being further weakened. The last instance of weakening in case-endings which need be quoted is that of the vocative of nouns of the *o*-declension, which is regularly weakened to *e*, as *Postume*.

The lightness of the vowel *i* is shewn in the frequent change from *e* before suffixes. In the majority of cases this may be accounted for by the affinity of *i* to *t* and *d*. But there are plenty of examples which shew simple weakening. Thus *pudi-bundus* is from a base *pude*², *pati-*

¹ II. 240.² Corss. II. 310.

bulum from base *pate*; *rubi-cundus* from base *rube*; and it was in all probability first written *rubecundus*, like *uere-cundus*, &c.: *tremebundus* and *tremibundus* both occur, the latter in Lucretius (l. 95). A greater weakening is seen in *domi-bus*, *uersi-bus*, &c. from *domu-*, *uersu-*; still greater in *publi-cus* from *poplo-* and *popolo-*, and indeed invariably before the suffix *-co-*; greatest of all in *cubi-culum* from the base *cuba*; and *uilicus* from *uilla*. With this rigidity Corssen¹ contrasts the flexibility of the Greek—shewn, e.g. in *Ὀλυμπιακός* and *θηλυκός*: yet even in Greek *-iko* is the favourite form. It will be observed the weakening to *i* before *c* and *b* is sufficiently common: further examples of the latter combination are *terri-bilis* from base *terrē*, *credi-bilis* from *crede*, *ludi-brium*, &c. We find *i* regularly before *m*, as *regimen*, *specimen*, *castimonia*, *sanc-timonia*, &c. Other instances (they are numerous) of this weakening before suffixes will be given in the section on Assimilation, which acts as a modifying cause determining the vowel in each case. The same weakening to *i* is found not infrequently in suffixes themselves. Thus *lo* becomes *li* in *gracilis*, *sterilis*²: *ro* becomes *ri* in *hilaris*, *celeris*, &c.: so also we have *volu-cris*, *ala-cris*; *mulie-bri-s*, *fune-bri-s*; *eques-tri-s*, *terres-tri-s*: the adjectives in *-tilis* are probably from an older *-tulo* or *-tilo*: and simple *-o* becomes *-i* in not a few cases, as *sublim-is*, *unanimis*, &c.; though the older form of the first is found in Lucretius³, and *unanimus* was used even in the Augustan age.

Next we come to weakening in Composition.

First we will take those cases where the first member of the compound has suffered: in these the loss has generally befallen the last syllable of a substantive, and is analogous to weakenings just mentioned in the last section. Thus *a* is weakened to *i* in *tubi-cen*, *causi-dicus*, &c.: *u* to *i* in *corni-ger*, *arci-tenens*, *flucti-uagus*, &c.: *o* very frequently to *i* in *armi-ger*, *fati-dicus*, and many

(ii) *Weakening in Composition:*
(a) *of the first member of the compound,*

¹ II. 309.

² *Sterilis* occurs Lucr. II. 845.

³ I. 340.

other examples given by Corssen¹. In all these cases the appearance of the light vowel *i* explains the nature of the change: it was the striving for lightness of form which caused the weakening. Sometimes, though rarely, we find *e* instead of *i* as in *bene-uolus*, *male-ficus*, &c.; the forms *beni-uolus*, *maliuolus*, *malificus* seem probably Plautine, but the MSS. vary². In these cases he also thinks that the *e* is later than the *i*, which is found in the MSS. of the comedians: this seems to me uncertain. At all events it appears that in many words the provincial Italian retained the older *e* where it passed in the written language into *i*: the compounds above given may therefore be instances where some accidental cause has presented a more original *e*, in the literary as well as in the spoken language.

So regular had the use of *i* at the end of the first part of the compound become, that even words taken from the Greek have their spelling altered to suit the rule. Thus, as Corssen points out³, names borrowed from the Greek comedy as *Δημοφῶν* and *Λημνοσελήνη* become on the Latin stage *Demipho* and *Lemniselene*; *τραγοκωμῳδία* itself is presented as *tragi-comoedia*; and at a later day, on the same analogy, the great *Μιθραδάτης* was known at Rome as *Mithridates*.

Secondly, let us take the more numerous and important cases where the second member of the compound has suffered. With this weakening of the Latin the Greek has no sympathy. The Greek shews singular facility in the compounding of verbs with prepositions: and these numerous compounds in process of time often ceased to be felt as such, and were used to express some one simple idea which had no apparent connection with the original meaning of the two members; yet the Greek language seems never to have lost its consciousness of the truly composite character of the word: even though the

(b) where
the second
member is
weakened.

¹ II. 318, &c.

² Corssen, II. 321.

³ II. 319.

meaning of the verb might be overpowered by the preposition, yet its form remained intact. Very different was it with the Latin. Here, as is obvious on the slightest glance, weakening is the rule; when the original form is retained, it is the exception. The primary vowel *a*, which we have seen elsewhere so rarely affected, is here the greatest sufferer of all, as indeed follows from its occurring in roots more frequently than any other vowel. When followed by a labial or *l*¹, it sometimes does not sink below *u*: thus we find *oc-cup-o* ($\sqrt{\text{cap}}$), *contubernium* ($\sqrt{\text{tab}}$), *in-sul-to* ($\sqrt{\text{sal}}$), and *in-sulsus* from *salsus*. But even the labial is commonly unable to stem its downward course: the older forms *de-rupio* and *sur-rupio* gave way to *de-ripio* and *surrupio*: and hosts of others, such as *prohibeo*, *mancipium*, *dissilio*, &c. will occur to every one. Before final consonants other than labials, the radical vowel sinks as a rule to *i*: before gutturals, as *re-ticeo* ($\sqrt{\text{tac}}$), *prodigium* ($\sqrt{\text{ag}}$); before linguals, as *profiteor* ($\sqrt{\text{fat}}$), *Jupiter*, or *Dies-piter*; before nasals, as *recino* ($\sqrt{\text{can}}$) and *inimicus*. Further, if the vowel be followed by two consonants as well as preceded by one at least, the vowel regularly sinks to *e*, as in the examples given above². In all these cases sufficient strength is supplied to the syllable by the combination of consonants: and therefore the original vowel is suffered to sink to the dull *e*, unless retained at some intermediate stage by especial affinities. Thus we have *peregrinus* from *ager*, *obsecro* from *sacer*; *ascendo* and *aspergo* from *scando* and *spargo*; but *infringo* and *contingo* from *frango* and *tango*, because the nasal here is not radical; it is only employed in the formation of the present base from $\sqrt{\text{frag}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{tag}}$. *Damno* in composition becomes *condemno*, from *annus* we have *biennium* and *sollennis*; *castus* passes into *incestus*, *tracto* into *detrecto*; from $\sqrt{\text{cap}}$ we get *auceps*, &c. in the nominative. In some isolated cases, as *imbecillus*, we find *e* without

¹ *Comp.* p. 258.² See pages 286, 288.

CH. VII.

the excuse of the two consonants: others, like *aequi-perare* and *per-petior*, may be accounted for by the affinities to be hereafter mentioned. *E* itself is weakened to *i* in numerous compounds, where it had taken the place of original *a* in the root: thus *lego* is *colligo* in composition; from *tenax* we get *pertinax*: but *e* is often retained, on no very clear grounds, except that these two vowels, as the weakest in the language, exchange place more easily. Corssen can give but one certain instance of *o* being shortened in composition, *illico* from *in loco*: he gives also *per-nic-ies*, compared with *noc-ere*: but the root is *nec*. *U* is never shortened. There are a few seemingly irregular instances of weakening of long vowels in composition, but always to *e* or *i*. Thus *halo* passes into *anhelo*; \sqrt{ag} , which is lengthened to $\bar{a}g$ in *ambages*, *imago*, *farrago*, &c., lets the \bar{a} pass into \bar{i} in many compounds, as *caligo*, *vertigo*, *robigo*; long *o* is weakened to short *i* in *cognitus* and *agnitus*¹, and long *u* to short *e* in *de-iero*, *pe-iero*, but retained in *per-iurus*. Lastly \bar{e} passes into \bar{i} in two cases—*subtilis* from *tela*, and *delinire* from *lenis*.

It has been already mentioned that these weakenings, although very common, are by no means without exceptions. The prevailing tendency never became universal; and this in most cases is to be accounted for by the sense of the composite nature of the words being retained. Sometimes we can see a reason for this, sometimes not. Thus *prohibere* acquired the general idea of preventing, losing the primary sense of holding a material obstacle "in front:" hence comes the weakening in form. But, either because of the stronger form of the preposition, or for some other reason, the primary sense of *post-habere* was felt even when used in cases where no putting behind in space was possible: and hence the retention of the original vowel. Again *Diupater* passed into *Jupiter* without preserving a trace in common use of its derivation:

¹ Unless we assume (with Corssen, II. 422) a participle *gnōtus* (compare *nōta*).

but the title *Janus-pater* was felt to be a compound from the use of its first member as a distinct word; and therefore the *a* never sank to *i*. And the idea of causation, which is obviously represented by compounds with *facere*, as *tepefacere*, &c., prevented the sinking of the vowel, which takes place in *conficere*, &c. In other cases I believe that assimilation has been the cause of many irregularities. This explains why the *a* maintained its place in *per-placet*, but not in *dis-plicet*; in *per-facilis*, but not in *dif-ficilis*. Another reason which Corssen has pointed out¹, by which the change has been prevented, is the necessity for distinguishing between distinct compounds. Thus *expando* was not allowed to sink into *expendo*, because of the necessity for keeping it distinct from the combination of *ex* and *pendo*: so also it was necessary to distinguish *contactum* from *contectum*. But this principle explains a very small number of instances.

Lastly, we come to weakening in Reduplicated forms.

This process (as Corssen observes) is closely connected with that just described: for Reduplication is really a sort of Composition. In the weakening of the syllable produced by Reduplication, the Greek and the Latin are on the whole in accord. Thus in the formation of present bases the vowel found in the new syllable is regularly *i*: we have *gi-gn-o* in Latin, as well as *γί-γν-ομαι* in the Greek; *si-st-o*, as well as *ἴ-στ-ημι*: sometimes, however, *e* is found: examples have been given in the section of Chapter VI. especially devoted to the uses of reduplication. So also in the formation of the perfect the vowel regularly used in each language is *e*: *τέ-τυφ-a* and *πέ-ποιθ-a* stand by *ce-cid-i* and *te-tul-i*: though it must be allowed that there is much less uniformity in the Latin than in the Greek here; the Latin employs the radical vowel in the new syllable not infrequently; not indeed the primary vowel *a*, but *o*, as in *po-posc-i* and *mo-mord-i*, *u* in *pu-pug-i* and *cu-curri*, and the weak *i* is kept in perhaps the

(iii) *Weakening in Reduplicated forms:*
(a) *of the reduplicated syllable,*

¹ II. 407.

only two verbs with radical *i* which have retained the reduplicated syllable, *di-dic-i* and *sci-scid-i*. But the strong tendency towards a uniform use of *e* is shewn by the other forms which were not uncommon in classical Latin—*pepugi*, *peposci*, &c.; but the original forms, *pu-pugi*, *poposci*, were again preferred, doubtless through the assimilating influence of the radical vowel. The *e* was regularly used for radical *a*, as in *dedi* (\sqrt{da}), *steti*, &c. We may infer then that the tendency to regard these new syllables as mere grammatical forms was strong even in Graeco-Italian days: and that while the Greeks after the separation attained to strict uniformity in this matter, the Italians, advancing no further, formed their tenses now on one principle, now on another: from which inconsistency we find in our grammars the anomalies of the “irregular verbs.” It is difficult to trace with certainty in Latin the process by which the reduplication was often altogether dropped. Corssen thinks that it began with the compound perfects: that in these by the “Old Latin law of accentuation” the accent fell on the first syllable, e.g. *ré-tetulit*, and thus forced out the *e* of the reduplication-syllable; whence *ré-t-tulit*. (Compare the French “je ne le sais pas,” where the *e* of the *ne* is lost in pronunciation.) Thus the ear grew accustomed to such possible forms as *tulit*, and when the “new law of accentuation” came in, and the accent was thrown forward in such words as *tetulisti*, the *e* again slipped out and left *t-tulisti*, *tulisti*; and in analogy with these accomplished facts the possible *tuli* also became actual¹.

(b) of the
radical
syllable.

The Latin treads its own peculiar path of degradation when it weakens the radical syllable as well; when it allows e.g. *pe-pag-i* (\sqrt{pag}) to sink into *pe-pig-i*. The same fate has befallen numerous verbs with radical *a*—*cado*, *tango*, &c. In other cases, chiefly when two consonants follow, *e* is found instead of *i*, in *fefelli* and *peperci*,

¹ I shall have occasion in a subsequent section to discuss Corssen's views respecting accentuation in Latin.

and in other cases by reason of some affinity, as to the *r* in *peperi* (from $\sqrt{\text{par}}$). Sometimes the radical vowel seems to have been lost altogether, as in *feci*, i.e. *fe-faci*, then *fe-f-c-i*; that the verb was really reduplicated in the first instance is shewn by the Oscan *fefācust* (i.e. *fecerit*) and *fefacid* (i.e. *fecit*)¹. This weakening of the second syllable would be analogous to that of the second member in a compound (*pe-pigi*, *im-pinga*), and produced by the same reason, the resting of the accent at one period upon the first syllable. Corssen however believes that the *ā* in the Oscan forms was the result of vowel intensification: and that the *ē* in Latin is a parallel lengthening; just as *ago* became *ēgi*. The reduplicated syllable must then have been lost altogether from the combined influence of quantity and accent falling on the radical syllable. This explanation undoubtedly accounts for the long vowel in Oscan, which is otherwise left unexplained.

II. ASSIMILATION.

So far we have seen the results of simple substitution upon the vowel system of Greek and Latin. A stronger vowel has passed into a weaker one in accordance with a regular scale of vowel-strength, differing indeed for the two languages, but constant in each. Before we look at the cases where this substitution has reached its natural limit—loss—let us see what modifying causes may have sometimes stemmed, sometimes altered, this downward progress: what influence other sounds, vowel or consonant, may have exerted in particular cases upon a vowel, which when no such influences were at work simply sank lower in the scale.

As I have before said, we shall find no such modification of the Greek vowels. They were too strong to become the mere reflex of a neighbouring consonant. In them

Vowel-change modified by external causes;

hardly at all in Greek;

¹ Corssen, II. 427.

CH. VII.

was manifested all the vital energy of the language. The nearest approach to such action is that which we have seen when two vowels were thrown together by the loss of a consonant, or by other means. Then we saw that one vowel could affect another, but very rarely did one of the two (strictly speaking) either assimilate or dissimilate the other: it did not change the other into a new distinct sound more like, or less like to itself: rather the two became blended into one, after a severe contest, in which the stronger gained the day, but generally retained the marks of the conflict. And, even so, the agent of the change was a vowel and not a consonant.

but frequently in Latin.

We may pass on then to the Latin, and see the results of the weakness of its vowel system, compared with the Greek. We have seen that the scale of vowel-strength in Latin is this—*a, o, u, e, i*: that is, a vowel allowed to sink gradually in strength, and not interfered with by other causes, would pass along this scale from *a* to *i*. And this order down to a certain point is always preserved. The vowel *a* is always the original vowel: it is never derived from anything else: it passes into *o* by weakening of articulation, and further down the scale. But neither *o* nor any other vowel ever rises; by assimilation or by any cause whatsoever, to *a*. Similarly *o* sinks to *u, e, i*: but *u, e* only rise to *o* under very exceptional circumstances: and *i* never does. These two vowels, then, retain their position in Latin as in Greek; they are not the creatures of the consonants. But here the difference in Latin begins. While the difference in strength between *a* and *o* was clearly felt, that between *u, e* and *i* was not so. Therefore these last three vowels occur often, not in their regular order but in dependence upon other sounds, through the principle of Assimilation. The difference in strength between the three vowels was not sufficiently great to make a particular divergence from the scale offensive to the “*Sprachgefühl*”: not only could a vowel which was gradually passing down the scale be stemmed at a particular

point, as at *u*, by a labial before or after it; but even a weaker sound such as *e*, the result of old substitution for *a*, can be carried backward up the scale to *u*; as \sqrt{pel} to *pul-sus*: the effort required to pronounce *u* was not so much greater than the effort required for *e*, as the effort to put the vocal organs in the position for *e*, when the uncongenial letter *l* immediately followed, was greater than the effort to sound the more cognate sounds *u* and *l*.

For this appears to me the most noticeable cause of Assimilation; two sounds, vowel or consonant, have to be pronounced together, one of which throws unusual difficulty into the path of the other: that other sound will probably be changed to one which is more compatible with that sound which has caused the difficulty: and may therefore be said to be assimilated to it. Such difficulty will commonly arise when the two sounds are pronounced at very nearly the same point of the tube or channel which begins with the glottis and ends with the lips, but with decidedly different mechanism. Mere closeness in the tube is not generally of itself sufficient to cause assimilation. Thus, for example, *i* and *y* are produced at exactly the same point in the mouth, but the position of the organs for one is perfectly compatible with that for the other: consequently there is no necessity to change either sound into something which will suit the other better. But now suppose that either *e* or *i* meets with *l*? By referring back to the description given of these sounds¹, it will be seen that for *e* (*ā*) and *i* (*ee*) a position of the mouth is required in which there is an opening between the raised tongue and the front palate—farther forward for *i* than for *e*. But in sounding *l* the point of the tongue is firmly pressed just against the centre of the front palate, the emission of breath taking place laterally. Now it is quite true that when a man pronounces his sounds—especially his vowel sounds—distinctly, there is no insuperable difficulty in keeping the open position necessary for *e* or *i* during the

Principle of Assimilation:

(i) *affinities produced by the avoidance of a difficult combination.*

¹ At page 96.

required length of time, and then closing it for *l*. But we are now talking of people who do not use this necessary care: for such people the coming *l* seems to throw its shadow over the preceding vowel: and instead of *e* or *i* we hear a vowel which is produced farther back in the palate, thereby avoiding the necessity of the double action at the same point: and the vowel which comes immediately behind *e* is *u*, which can be sounded even whilst the tongue is in the act of closing for *l*¹. And since the greater ease of the combination *ul* can thus even raise the easier vowels *e* and *i* to *u*, which requires not only a more constrained position of the tongue, but also an action of the lips, which the other two do not; it is *à fortiori* intelligible why the occurrence of *l* can stem the natural descent of the vowel at the point *u*, as we have seen it do in the last chapter. This relation between *u* and *l* is commonly expressed (as by Corssen) by saying that *u* has an affinity for *l*—a phrase which is convenient, but which requires explanation. The same vowel however may have affinities for other consonants or combinations of consonants which throw similar difficulties in the way of sounding other vowels: this will appear in the following pages.

(ii) *Affinities produced by case of combination.*

The affinity is simpler and more intelligible when the vowels *e* and *i* are the result of assimilation by consonants. The affinity of *e* is for *r* in Latin, and, though less markedly, in other languages. I call it simpler for this reason: there is no such obstacle to any vowel-sound presented by *r* as there was by *l*. The channel is open for *r* in the centre, just where it is closed for *l*. This is true even of the English *r*, the central sound. But it is much more true of the laxly vibrated or trilled *r*, which was probably the Latin as it is now the Italian *r*. For this, as has been already pointed out, the closure is never quite complete,

¹ Compare Roby, *Grammar*, p. 12. "When two incompatible sounds come together, usually the difficulty is foreseen, and instead of the organs being left, after pronouncing the former, to do what they can with the latter, the anticipation works a change in the former, or at least acts so as to preserve the latter."

but the tongue is laid loosely along the palate, only very slightly closer than it is in the open position for *e*. The difference of position is so small that, in producing a trilled *r*, an *e* is almost inevitably produced with it. This then is a pure affinity: not the result of an attempt to avoid a difficult combination, but merely falling into one which is by its own nature easy. The affinity of *i* for the dentals, if it exists at all¹, must be of the same nature. It would seem to be a fair inference from such an affinity that *t*, *d*, *n* must have been pronounced farther forward than with us, i.e. that they were more truly "dentals." Otherwise, if they had been pronounced just at the same place as *i*, we might have expected that there would have been a struggle to avoid the combination, instead of a liking for it. But there is other evidence to shew that the dentals in Latin were sounded at much the same point as with us, only not firmly; for which reason they often pass into other sounds: whereas *l* undoubtedly was a firm and distinct sound at the end of a syllable: hence the difficulty to be avoided in *el* or *il* would be greater than that of *it* or *id*.

Lastly, it may be added that *e* and *i* are simple sounds produced by the action of the tongue only: *u*, on the contrary, is complex, produced both by tongue and lips. It is more intelligible on this ground also that *e* and *i* should exhibit a simple affinity to particular consonants. It is possible that some of the affinities of *u* may be due to the labial action, and belong therefore to the second class: such may be the affinity for *b* and *m*: the perfect closure of the lips in sounding *b* and *m* may cause them to pass through the position necessary for *u*, and so check the progress of a preceding vowel which might otherwise have sunk to *e* or *i*: it never, so far as I know, raises *e* or *i* to *u*, as *l* does.

I now proceed to give examples of assimilation of both these classes in Latin. I shall take, first, assimilation produced by consonants; assimilation caused by vowels will

1. Vowel assimilation caused by consonants:

¹ See pages 304 and 309.

come next. It requires no introductory remarks; its nature is obvious: it shews a curious tendency towards monotony of sound, which marks a language whose vowel-system is weak.

The cases where the progress of descent has been stemmed, and where it has been altered by neighbouring sounds, may be considered together.

(i) *the*
vowel u.

(i) Where the vowel in which the change results is *u*.

If we take first the connecting-vowel, which was commonly *o* in Graeco-Italian, and which of all vowels was most likely to sink to its lowest form¹, we shall observe that in some few verbs in Latin it was retained at the point *u* by the influence of the labial-nasal *m*, as *sumus*, *volumus*: but in some verbs, which otherwise bear a strong resemblance to these in that oldness of form which at a later period seems a mark of irregularity, we find the *u* already thinned down to *i*, as *ferimus*:—just as in other simple verbs, i.e. those of the so-called third conjugation. Here therefore the vowel was kept, for some time in an early period of the language, at *u* by the assimilating effect of the *m*. A similar effect—also not permanent—was produced by *f* in the days of Plautus, when *sacro-ficus* stopped at *sacruficus*², before passing yet lower to *sacrificus*, or *carnifex* rose to *carnufex*. So also *b* produced *bu-bus*, and *Hecuba*, the older form of which was *Hecoba*³. But the consonant which has by far the greatest affinity for *u* is *l*. This affinity moreover was in full operation during the classical period of Roman literature: it differs from those mentioned above, which had then almost died out. On the other hand, it would seem to have begun later: for we read *cosol* and *consol* on the tombs of three of the Scipios: while the introduction of the new sound is shewn by the wavering spelling—*u* or *o* indifferently—on inscriptions of a somewhat later date. Corssen has proved that the new sound was established among educated men at the close

¹ See p. 286.

² E. g. *Most.* 243.

³ *Quint. i.* 4. 16; see page 282.

of the Republic, but that it never became general among the provincials, from whom the original *o* was handed down to all the Romance dialects; just like the provincial *e* for *i* mentioned already.

The principal reason of this effect of the *l* has been described above: but the nature of the sound in Latin may have contributed to produce the effect, which is more decided in this language than in any other which I know. *L* was generally a strong sound in Latin: it is said by Pliny¹ to have had a middle sound at the beginning of a word, as *lectus*; to have been strong at the end of a word—*sol*, or a syllable—*silua*, or after a consonant in the same syllable, as *clarus*. (Hence no doubt the frequent loss of such consonant or consonants, as (*c*)*lamentum*, (*st*)*locus*, &c.) He calls it weak only when it follows another *l*, as *ille*. This seems to shew that the sound of the first *l* in such places was so strong that a second one was felt to be required to express it: hence the constant variation in writing, as *Aquilius* and *Aquillius*; also the occurrence of two *ls* where etymologically there should have been but one, as *querella* and perhaps *relligio* (but the first *l* here may be an assimilated *d*), or one *l* instead of two, as *paulum*, *belua*, *solennis*. I do not now think that this assimilation is due to *l* having (like *r*) something of the vowel about it. In Sanskrit indeed there occurs a vowel *li*, also a vowel *ri*: and we shall see hereafter that it was a slightly heard vowel in these two consonants which led to the loss of original vowels before them, as in *uinc(u)lum*, and *dext(e)ra*. But it cannot be assumed from this that a vowel before *l* had a natural tendency to turn to *u* in Latin.

The *l* was especially powerful when followed by another consonant, in which case the preceding vowel was nearly always altered to *u*—the vowel which under the circumstances required the least effort to produce. Thus *a* passed into *u*, as *flauos* and *flagro* into *fuluos* and *fulgor*, when,

¹ See Corssen, i. 219.

CH. VII.

through the strong dislike of the Italians for a heavy consonantal beginning, the *l* as the second consonant was thrown further onwards in the word: *e* became *u* very much more commonly, as *pello*, *pulsus*; *percello*, *perculsus*; *sepelio*, *sepultus*, and a host of others; compare too the Latin *mulgeo* with the Greek ἀμέλω: *o* almost equally often as *colo*, *cultus*; *adolesco*, *adultus*; *stolidus*, but *stultus*; *collis* and *columna* but *culmen*; *pollen* but *pulvis*: and compare *bulbus* with βόλβος, *sulcus* with ὄλκος. Indeed the flexibility of the Greek vowels in the same position is best seen by Corssen's examples¹ of words taken from the Greek by the Italians at an early period, and pronounced and written after their rule: thus πᾶσσαλος becomes *pes-sulus*, Σίκελος is *Siculus*, φαινόλης is *paenula*.

N combined with another consonant has the same effect as *l*, in detaining the preceding vowel at the step *u*. Thus *nuntius*, *Acherun(t)i*s, *hunc*, diminutives like *ratiuncula*, contractions like *homullus* (from *homonulus*), are all instances of a vowel which has fallen from *o*, but no more than one step. In the same way *mn* detain the *u* in *alumnus*, *Vertumnus*, *columna*, *aerumna*, and all that class; and *mp* or *mb* in *trumpus*, *umbo* (ὄμφαλός), *columba*, &c. That the nasals were the cause seems clear, because before two consonants a vowel in Latin commonly sank to *e*: and this is not surprising, since *m* was the first of the two, and could stem an *o* even when alone. But I do not understand the effect of the combinations in which *n* stands first: commonly there is no objection to an *e* before these, as in *mens*, *pendeo*, &c.: probably *n* with another letter was equivalent in strength to *l*, and could sometimes produce the same effect. The cases are not on the whole very numerous, and it would seem that the tendency was strongest in pre-Augustan times, and then rather ceased, for Ennius wrote *frundes*, and Lucilius *dupundi*. Among the provincials the *o*-sound was probably often retained,

¹ II, 142.

and passed on to the Romance language, e.g. *molto*, *mondo*, &c.

(ii) Where the vowel in which the change results is *e*.

(ii) the
vowel *e*.

This result, as will be inferred from the previous account, is produced especially by *r*, the most cognate of the consonants. This is most conspicuous in the cases of neuters ending in *us* (*os*), where between the two vowels *s* passed into *r*, e.g. *genos-is* became *genoris* and then *generis*; so also *operis*, *sideris*, *ueteris*, and a very large number of similar nouns. It is perfectly impossible to say why in *corporis*, *pecoris*, *facinoris*, *dedecoris*, and several others, the *o* was still retained: some principle of assimilation or dissimilation between the vowels may have helped, but it was not the same for all. Sometimes the double form occurs: *feneris* and *pigneris* are both old, yet they did not expel the *o* forms: *temperi* is preferred for the adverb (i.e. the locative), *tempori* for the dative¹: I know no other case where even so slight use of the difference was made. In other cases original *i* rises to *e* from the influence of *r*: as *cinis*, *cineris*; so also *uomeris*, *pulueris*. Next, Corssen quotes the terminations *ber*, *cer*, and *ter*, the vowel of which in Indo-European was certainly *a*². The uniformity of the vowel before the termination *-ro-* (*-ero*) has been already contrasted³ with the easier Greek vocalism. Lastly, in the conjugation of verbs *e* is always attracted by *r*, which in Latin seems to have had a peculiar sound; so *dedi-sont* passed into *dedē-runt*⁴.

I mentioned above, that *e* is the favourite vowel of the Latin in closed syllables before more than one consonant, as *vertex* (from *vertic-*), *silex*, *apex*, *ilex*, &c.; the compounds of *√cap* (seen in *hosti-capā-s*, and occurring as *cup* before a vowel, as *occupo*), e.g. *anceps*, *manceps*, &c.; *ales* for *alit-s*, *miles*, *abies*, *hospes*, &c.; *hones-tus* from *honos*, *scelestus* from *scelus*, *pedester* for *pedit-ter(o)-*, and numerous

¹ The form *temperi* occurs 19 times in Plautus; *tempori* not at all; neither in Terence. Wagner on Plaut. *Aul.* 451.

² Corssen, II. 200.

³ See page 282.

⁴ Corssen, II. 203.

CH. VII.

others. This combination even caused a further weakening of *u*, as *ferentem*, &c. (contrast *euntem*); the old *u* being retained in legal formulae. The reason of this, it seems to me, lies in the dulness of the vowel: it has the least amount of character of any; and therefore it best suits a syllable in which the consonantal element is strong. Prof. Heyse's character of *e* may be assented to without difficulty; with respect to the other vowels his conclusions are so ingenious that one cannot but wish that they were borne out by facts. Of *e* he says that it is the vowel of least "tone:" it expresses less of sensation than any other, and consequently extends its dominion over speech with ever-increasing force, as the exponent of reasonable speech: colourless as water, it serves as the element to float consonants: it is the voice of emotionless reasonable speech¹.

(iii) the
vowel *i*.

(iii) Where the vowel in which the change results is *i*. It may seem needless to treat of this vowel as the result of assimilation. If *i* be the weakest of the vowels, it must be the point to which all vowels sink if left to their own course, without any modifying influences. It may be said on the other side that *i* is not invariably the weakest of the Latin vowels: there are cases in which *i* has sunk to *e*, as we have already seen, at the end of a word, or when the final consonant was so little heard that the vowel was really final. But I do not think that in any of these or similar instances *i* has been kept back by assimilating influences from sinking to *e*. The assimilation therefore in this case must be understood to be no more than the result of affinity between *i* and other sounds, which generally compelled a vowel to sink as low as it could in the scale: it might not have done so, had

¹ Heyse, *System der Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 79. I owe my knowledge of this brilliant writer to Dr Farrar's *Chapters on Language*. In the chapter from which the above is quoted, he distinguishes the vowels as the natural exponents of different sensations: a distinction which, it is to be feared, has perished in a far pre-historic stage of language, at least for the other vowels. See *Chapters on Language*, p. 86, note.

no such influence been at work. But I have already said that the affinity of *i* for the dentals is by no means easy to explain. According to Corssen¹, who rejects Priscian's rule that final *n* was strong, medial *n* weak—*n* was strong in the middle of a word, at least where it was an element of either base or suffix: it can hardly have been strong in a prefix, such as *con*, when it generally vanished. Corssen instances the various spelling of words like *Porsena* or *Porsenna* to prove his theory; just as the strength of medial *l* was inferred from the same reason. If this be so, we can understand why *n*, which is a fine clear sound if pronounced with distinctness, would naturally draw to it the finest and most distinct of the vowels. But undoubtedly the nearness of the points at which the two sounds were produced has also much to do with the fact; and we shall see that *i* has an affinity for other dentals as well. The *i* occurs before *n* in *terminus* (Greek -μενο-), in *diutinus*, where the suffix is the Indo-European -tana; regularly before the suffix -no, as in *dominus*, *geminus*, *sarcina*, *pagina*, &c.: it supplants *o* in oblique cases from bases in *on*, as *cardo(n)*, *cardin-is*, and *ordinis*, *hominis*, *marginis*, &c.: and occurs in a few radical syllables, as in *Minerua* for older *Menerua*, and *vindico* (compare *uenia*). This tendency to substitute *i* for *e*, as we have already seen, was the mark of cultivated, as opposed to rustic, Italian.

I was also attracted to the dental spirants. The best proof lies in the transliteration of *κωμάζω* by *commissor* (the double *s* required to represent *ζ* may have had a peculiar force here) or *κάναστρον* by *canistrum*; here again we have two dentals at work. But the same change occurs regularly before *sc*: as *tremisco*², *adipisco*, *gemisco*, &c.: the *e* is generally retained however when the *sc* is added to a verbal base in *ē*, as *feruē-sco*, &c.; yet even here sometimes both forms are found; we have *conticiscam*,

¹ I. 248.² But *tremesco*, Lucr. vi. 518.

CH. VII.

luciscit, &c.¹ An important example of the attraction of *s* alone is furnished by the termination of comparatives, *-ius* for older *-ios*. Here the *i* was sometimes absorbed by the *u*, as in *minus*: but more commonly the *u* itself sank to *i*, which then coalesced with the preceding *i*, and should therefore have produced a long final syllable in *magis*, *satis*, &c.; but the weak pronunciation of the last syllable in Latin seems in every case to have let the long vowel pass away². Lastly, *i* occurs in connection with *t* and *d*. The instances where this assimilating power is best seen are the participles or participial formations from the second conjugation, as *meritus* from *mere-* (but *merētod* occurs in the well-known epitaph of the son of Barbatus), *tacitus* from *tacē*, and others too many to quote. The same change is seen sometimes, though rarely, in the first conjugation, as *domitum*, *cubitum*, *crepitum*, *uetitum*, &c. In these cases we must suppose that stress was laid habitually on the first syllable: then the middle syllable could not maintain its length, and the shortened vowel easily sank to *i*. The fact that *i* is always found before the suffixes *-tion*, *-tia*, *-tāt*, *-tudin*, *-do*, &c., should perhaps not be pressed as an instance of assimilation, for we have already seen³ that in all such formations the final vowel of the base has a natural tendency to sink to *i* as the easiest vowel, e.g. in *belli-cus*, *rubi-cundus*, &c. In spite of the tendency to *e* before two consonants we find *i* when both are dentals: e.g. *intus* (*ἐντός*), *indu*, for the *endo* of the XII. Tables, *uindico* (mentioned above) and *uindex*, *uindemia*, &c.: also before *gn* in *ignis*, *tignum*, *signum*, *pignus*, which is some slight ground for believing that the *g* here was the guttural nasal: however the same change is seen where the *g* follows the *n* in *lingua*, *tinguo*, *pinguis*, &c. and seems due here to the *n* alone.

In conclusion then, the three weak vowels have their own peculiar affinities; *u* for *l* and labials, and *e* for *r* and

¹ Plaut. *Mil.* 410; Terence, *Heaut.* 410.² Corssen, II. 299.³ At page 287.

closed syllables; *i* for dentals: these affinities being the result either of the difficulty of other combinations or of the nearness of the point of contact of the two sounds.

Next we have to consider the cases where one vowel has assimilated another. This phenomenon is of comparatively rare occurrence. We have often had occasion to remark the weakness of the Latin vowel-system: consequently we shall not expect the vowels to exercise so strong an influence over another vowel as the consonants did. The following examples are derived, as before, almost entirely from Corssen.

(i) When two vowels come into actual contact, they have a tendency to approximate to each other.

Thus when *y* was resolved into *i* in (*e*)*syam*, the subjunctive of *√es*, the difference in point of distance between the two vowels *i* and *a* made the form *siam* unpleasant: hence, through the influence of the *i*, the *a* became *e*, in the form *siem*, which constantly occurs in Plautus¹. That *a* really occurred in this form in Latin, as well as in Graeco-Italian or Indo-European, is shewn by those cases where the *y* was entirely dropped, not resolved into *i*, when the *a* remained intact; as in *reg(y)am*. So also we have *eam* from *√i*, *queam* from *√qui*—where the radical vowel is changed. We have already seen that the Italians kept *e* in many words where it sank to *i* in the Latin: with the same preference for that sound they assimilated *i* to *e* in the common termination *-io*: thus Corssen² quotes *fileai* from Praeneste, at an earlier date than 218 B.C.; not forty years later than *filios* of the younger Scipio's tomb. Similarly, the difficulty of the combination *ia* produced the numerous class of secondary nouns in *-ies*, e.g. *durities* by the side of *duritia*.

Another effect of this assimilating influence of one vowel on another is to check in some cases the same power when exercised by a consonant. We have seen already that *o* followed by *l* almost always sinks to *u*. But this

2. Vowel assimilation caused by vowels.

¹ E.g. *Capt.* 736.

² II. 310.

change does not take place when *i* or *e* precede *o*: apparently the labial action for *u* was felt to be inconsistent with these two vowels; and they therefore by their assimilating power retain the original *o* in *uiola*, *filiolus*, *gladiolus*, &c.; in *aureolus*, *luteolus*, &c.¹

(ii) When two vowels are separated from each other by a consonant, they tend to become identical.

Thus *e* assimilates a preceding vowel in *bene*, originally *bono*, which by regular weakening became *bone*; then the feeling of the coming *e* in the last syllable modified the *o* in the first. Similarly *illec-ebrae* owes the *e* of its second syllable \sqrt{lic} to that of the third. *O* has changed *u* and *e* in a previous syllable, in *soboles* (*sub*) and *socordia* (*se*). So also *u* has operated in the suffix of *tug-urium* on the vowel of \sqrt{teg} , and perhaps caused partial assimilation in *so-luo*, *so-lutus* for *se-luo*, like *se-cors*; we find *lucuna* for *lacuna*, and *rutundus* in Lucretius². I think it possible that the same influence may have produced *diurnus* (*dies*), and *arbustum* (*arbos*). But more numerous are the cases where *i* has affected a preceding vowel. Thus *ne-hilum* becomes *nihil*: the old *i* in *mihi* is preserved by the final *i*, though in *mei*, *meus*, &c. it has become *e*: \sqrt{sul} in *consulo* passes into *sil* in *consilium*, *facul* becomes *facilis*; *semol* (*simul*) becomes *similis*: and \sqrt{cal} , which is found in $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ and *calim* (the old form of *clam* according to Festus), becomes *occulo*, but *super-cil-ium*: *Caecus* becomes *Caecilius*; and contrast *Proculus* with *Procilius*, *Lucullus* with *Lucilius*. I do not think that *inquilinus* by *incola*, *inspicio* by \sqrt{spec} , can be fairly quoted as instances³: because the vowel would have in each case sunk to *i* by itself. A forward action is clearly to be seen, as I think, in *difficilis* and *displicet*⁴: *i* is not found in *perfacilis* and *perplacet*, where no *i* precedes.

It appears from these examples that by far the greatest part in this kind of assimilation is played by the vowel

¹ II. 347.² Corssen, II. 359.³ II. 451, III. 1031.⁴ See page 293.

i—the weakest of all : a fact which is certainly surprising. Corssen¹ gives the analogy of *ä, ö, ü* in German, which are commonly produced by an *i* in the following syllable : e.g. *mann, männlich* : and he concludes that *i*, thin though it be, requires for its pronunciation a considerable tension of the organs of speech, differing herein much from *e*. This explanation is most unsatisfactory. It is this effort required in pronunciation, and nothing else, which is the mark of a *strong* vowel : and yet nothing can be plainer than the fact that *i* is weaker than *a, o, or u*. And certainly no such tension is absolutely required to sound the *i*, though greater power may accidentally be applied to it, as it may also to *e*. The truth is that the real cause of the change is not the influence of the *i* : the real cause is the natural tendency of every vowel to grow weaker in Latin : the *i* only lends a helping hand, determining how far the change should operate—in this case to the utmost possible limit, sometimes giving an additional impulse to the vowel affected, which might otherwise have resisted the primary tendency, as *difficilis*, mentioned above. In a word, it is only a modifying, at most an auxiliary cause of the change : and this is in accordance with the view of Assimilation which I have given. Corssen² gives some interesting examples of *a* produced by assimilation in the late popular Latin : e.g. *ansar* for *anser*, *parantalia*, &c. : and he points out how *a* in this way appears sometimes in the Romance languages, e.g. *marchand* from late Latin *marcator*, *sauvage* from *salvaticus* (*silua*). It seems to me unquestionable, that this *a*, so produced, was not the full sound (ah) in Latin : though it may have become so in the descendants of the Latin, all of which, as has been pointed out, were subjected to foreign influences. It may have been (*ǣ*), but more probably the neutral vowel³. It is observable, that in almost all cases this *a* precedes an *r*, or *l*, that is, just the two

¹ II. 380.² II. 373.³ See page 93.

CH. VII.

sounds before which the neutral vowel is most common in England, e.g. *altar*, *fatal*.

III. DISSIMILATION.

This principle has of course a less wide field than that which we have just considered. The same sound is less likely to occur twice in inconvenient proximity, than different sounds. Like Assimilation, it is sometimes an auxiliary cause of new change, sometimes it prevents the regular process of change. Its operation is restricted to some of the places in which either by regular substitution, or by the loss of a letter, or by the resolution of a semi-vowel into a vowel, or by the addition of suffixes to roots or bases, or by two of these causes combined, the *same* vowel-sound occurred twice. It acts, I say, only in some of these places, because the most obvious method was to let the two vowels so meeting coalesce into one long vowel: and this often took place. For example, when *sequ-ontur* was tending to become *sequ-untur* by the regular substitution of *u* for *o*, since the double *u* would have been difficult to pronounce, the two often coalesced, and (*q* being rarely written after the loss of its peculiar attendant *u*) the result was *sec-untur*, when the tendency to weaken *o* to *u* in these forms had become too strong and too universal to be resisted. But the natural dislike to such a transformation is seen in the fact that the old spelling *sequontur* was still retained even in the Augustan age, side by side with the new. Similarly we find in indifferent use *equos* and *ecus*, *aequom* and *aecum*, *quom* and *cum*, &c. In all these cases this retention of the *o*, this bar to the regular change, is due to the principle of Dissimilation. In some instances no doubt this principle was aided by another cause. If the weakening of *o* to *u* had taken place, and the two vowels had then coalesced, there would often have resulted much confusion. Thus

Less frequent in its operation: acts principally as a bar to further change.

voltus would have been allowed to sink into *ultus*; *uolnus* into *ulnus*, &c. Here therefore there was all the more need for letting the natural tendency to Dissimilation act fully.

Corssen gives as examples of this bar, beside the well-known *volt*, *uolcanus*, &c., the cases where original *o* is retained in the suffix *-olus*, which generally sank to *-ulus*; as *friuolus*, *Scaeuola*, &c.¹ The combination *uu* seems to have only been tolerated when another vowel followed, in which case the second *u* was of course really the semi-vowel *v*, and there was no real meeting of identical sounds, e.g. in *illuuiēs*.

The meeting of *i* with *i* occurred more frequently: e.g. from the resolution of *ei* into *i*, as *petiei*, *petii*; *uieis*², *uiis*. Here the combination was allowed, because contraction would in such cases have produced immense confusion: but where possible it was permitted. Thus when *De-is* became *Diis* by weakening, it was at once shortened into *Dis*; and genitives like *Vergilii* were also contracted, except when a poet found the older form more convenient. To avoid the double *i*, the radical vowel of *√iac* was long kept at *e*, e.g. *proiecere*, *traiecere*, &c., found in Lucretius and Virgil; and when the *e* had sunk to *i*, the difficulty was avoided by dropping one of the vowels, as *obicio*, *adicio*, &c.³

But when the difficult combination arose from the meeting of the end of a nominal base with a case-suffix, or even a new formative suffix, then dissimilation stepped in and prevented the occurrence of the sound. One of the two vowels became *e*; thus *ali-inus* became *alienus*. Similarly when *e* would naturally have sunk to *i* in the last syllable of the root, it was retained, as in *abietis*, not *abiitis*, and *Anienis* from *Anio(n)*, though from *cardo(n)*

¹ II. 392, &c.

² See p. 264.

³ At a somewhat late time, if we may judge from poetry. Thus Virgil (*Aen.* vi. 420) has *obicit offam* (= *obyicit*), but Lucan (ix. 188) *Pompeiumque deis obicit*. Yet in Virgil we find *reice* scanned as a dissyllable, which could not be if each *i* was heard.

we have *cardinis*. So also in the formation of a secondary noun we see the same influence. Although before *-tat* bases in *o* regularly allow the *o* to sink into *i* (as from *uero-*, *ueritat-*), yet if *i* precedes, the *o* does not sink below *e*, as in *pie-tat-*, *uarié-tat-*, and many others¹. The root AG is frequently used to form a sort of causal verb²; in which case the vowel naturally sinks to *i*, or is altogether lost, e.g. *leuigare*, *pur(i)gare*, *obiurigare*³ and *iur(i)gium*. But when *i* precedes, this vowel was kept at *e*, as *uariegare*. Lastly, the older form of the genitives *ipsius*, *illius*, &c. is to be accounted for on this principle. We have seen the *u* occurring in forms like *corporus* (p. 283), a weakening of Graeco-Italian *-os*. But this *u* regularly sank to *i*, and consequently we might have expected to find *ipsiis* or *ipsis*: the change was prevented by the preceding *i*. In *uiétus* (which is apparently the participle of *uieo*, with the sense of flexible, flaccid) the *e* has been retained by reason of the preceding *i*.

Finally, the combination *ee* is avoided in *eeis* by the forms *eis* or *ieis*, both in the nom. and the dat. or abl. plural. And the only reason, apparently, why we find the one relic of the older form of the present participle, so often mentioned, *euntem*, is that if the usual weakening took place in it, we should have a double *e* sound.

The *ι*, which is regularly found in Greek reduplicated presents (*μλ-μ(ε)ν-ω*, &c.), may perhaps be due to this principle⁴. Also in Attic Greek, we may explain the retention of the original formative-suffix *α*, in such words as *έστία*, *γενέα*, by the fact that *ι* or *ε* precedes it, and prevents the usual change of *α* to *η*.

These, with a few others of the same class, are the main examples of Dissimilation—a principle which (as will

¹ Corssen, i. 310.

² So apparently in A. S. we have *éad-ig-an*, to make happy, from *éad*, happiness, *fand-ig-an*, to cause to find, to search out, tempt.

³ In Plautus, *Trin.* 68, ed. Brix, though Fleckeisen reads *obiurgito*, not so well, I think.

⁴ See page 275, where it is classed under Substitution.

have been observed) acts almost exclusively in hindering weakening, which but for it would, on the analogy of similar forms, have certainly taken place.

IV. Loss.

I return for a short time to the Greek. As the last two forms of change had little effect on the vigorous vowel-system of the Greek, it is only natural that it should have suffered still less from loss. It is seen irregularly in words like $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta(\alpha)\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma(\epsilon)\chi\omicron\nu$ from $\sqrt{\sigma\epsilon\chi}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma(\epsilon)\pi\acute{o}\mu\eta\nu$ (where the rough breathing is wrong, but follows the analogy of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{o}\mu\eta\nu = \acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\eta\nu = \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\mu\eta\nu = \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\eta\nu$), $\eta\lambda(\nu)\theta\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi(\epsilon)\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$, &c.; but generally the fuller form is also in use. In only one class of words a vowel is dropped permanently and regularly, viz. those verbs which formed their continuous stem by reduplication. Many of the cases have been already mentioned; as $\gamma\acute{\iota}\text{-}\gamma(\epsilon)\nu\text{-}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\mu\acute{\iota}\text{-}\mu(\epsilon)\nu\omega$, $\pi\acute{\iota}\text{-}\pi(\epsilon)\tau\text{-}\omega$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\phi(\epsilon)\nu\text{-}\omega$, &c. It would seem that the first syllable was pronounced with greater force than the radical one: as was natural, if this new part of the word was felt to modify the conception of the root: then the loss of the radical vowel would be facilitated by the great similarity in sound of the two consecutive syllables, for conscious effort is required to place the vocal organs twice in the same or nearly the same position. It will be observed that the lost vowel should in each case by the ordinary Greek law have borne the accentual mark. This loss of a vowel, on which at any rate some stress must have been laid, is surprising, whatever we suppose the nature of that stress to have been; but more so, I think, on the hypothesis that it was a force-accent than on any other. The difficulty is partly removed if we postulate (with Corssen) an older Greek law of accentuation, in which the pitch was not yet bound by the quantity of the last syllable: if then the pitch being free coincided with the force upon the first syllable, we can

1. *Loss
of Greek
vowels.*

easily understand the loss of the following vowel. But the evidence from Greek for this theory is slight¹; though the supposition is antecedently credible enough: it is improbable that the peculiar Greek cadence (see above, p. 213, note 3) should have established itself in all its completeness at once, instead of being gradually developed out of less artificial modes of pronunciation. But as it is nowise clear that the mere pitch on one syllable would obscure the vowel of the next, we must still assume the coincidence of pitch and force.

Lastly, we find a vowel sometimes lost in formative suffixes before a case-suffix, e.g. $\pi\alpha\tau(\epsilon)\rho\text{-}\acute{o}\varsigma$. The fact that the ϵ does not fall out in the accusative where it is accented, whilst the genitive and dative have the accent on the case-suffix, implies some connection between the accent and the loss. But why the accent was on the suffix in the genitive and dative alone, is not so easily answered.

¹ It consists (1) of the forms given above, in which the pitch-accent is presumed to have been always on the first syllable; (2) of nouns ending in $\omega\varsigma$, as $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, &c., where the accent stands regularly on the first syllable in spite of the length of the ultima; as the penultima is often scanned as a full short it cannot have been always slurred over in pronunciation, though doubtless it was sometimes: (3) of the words ending in α and α which are accented on the antepenultima; these cannot have really been long in scanning and short in accentuation: (4) of some feminines like $\epsilon\theta\pi\nu\alpha(\text{F})\alpha$, $\delta\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon(\sigma)\alpha$, &c., in which the final α was no doubt originally long.

The theory of the original freedom of the accent is maintained by Corssen in the third division of his work on the Latin language: that which deals with accentuation (*Betonung*). It is confirmed to some extent by the analogous Sanskrit verb-forms, which in the singular at least are accented on the reduplicated syllable: the augment too is accented in Sanskrit, naturally, since, whatever its meaning was, it was certainly a new word added from without and alien to the verb. But the value of Corssen's results is seriously impaired by his constant confusion of pitch and force. Some of his arguments are applicable to pitch, and he believes (I think) that the classical accent was a pitch-accent: but other arguments he applies are valid only on the assumption that it was a force-accent: and practically he jumbles the two together, and compares the results of accent in different languages on the tacit assumption that accent was a single cause and the same cause everywhere: an assumption which is unquestionably false. (See on this subject the article by A. J. Ellis, already often mentioned, in the *Phil. Soc. Trans.*, 1873—4, and especially pp. 144—154, for the nature of classical accent.)

Examples of loss in Latin are much more numerous—another proof of the weakness of the Latin vowel-system compared with the Greek. They are so various that it is difficult to bring them under general heads. Perhaps the best plan will be to give a list of the most important, and see afterwards what general conclusions may be drawn from them:

Corssen¹ now rejects the hypothesis that *a* is lost in the perfects of the first conjugation—e.g. *cub(a)ui*, *nec(a)-ui*,—formed, like others of the same class, from the bases *cubā*, *necā*, &c. by the addition of *ui* the remnant of *fui*²: for it is possible that this termination was joined directly to the simple root, in which case there would have been no loss of *a*, whilst the present was formed from a base *crepā*: compare ἔ-γημ-*a* from √γαμ, but γαμέ-ω, in Greek: and in one case at least we have an infinitive, *son-ēre*. On the other hypothesis the weakened supine *cubitum*, where the reason for the *i* lies in the dental *t*, probably led the way to *cubīui* and then to *cubui*. In nouns this loss is rare: but *uirgo* may be a shorter form of *uirāgo*³: *clarus* with *clamor* and *gratus* are from √cal and √ghar (χαρά): and Corssen points to *palma* and *cupressus*, which represent the Greek παλάμη and κυπάρισσος.

The loss of *o* (I take the vowels according to their strength) is even more rare. We find *vict(o)rix*, *alt(o)rix*, *pist(o)rina*, &c. where the new suffix has forced out the vowel of the old.

The next vowel—*u*—is only lost before *l*: and I have before said that *l* has something of the vowel in itself. Thus *vinclum*, as is well known, occurs at least as often as the older *vinculum* in verse-writers even of the Augustan age. Others like *poclum*, *vehiclum*⁴ do not seem to occur in the literary dialect later than the Plautine age, till

CH. VII.

2. Loss of Latin vowels.

Loss of *a*;Loss of *o*;Loss of *u*;¹ Corss. II. 520 note.² See Schleicher, *Comp.* 828.³ It is connected, perhaps with more probability, by Curtius with ὀργάω, ὀργάδες, from a root *VARĜ*=to swell.⁴ Plaut. *Pers.* 775, 782.

poelum is found again in Prudentius. Some words appear with a double form in Plautus, as *populus* and *poplus*, *disciplina* and *discipulina*, and *templo* but *extempulo*¹. These "syncopated forms" when they occur in Latin poets are generally explained as "poetical licences"—a radically false theory, if it means that Virgil and Horace used irregular forms which ordinary men of the time could not have used. The truth is the very opposite of this statement: a pronunciation of *vinculum* and similar words, in which the *u* was either barely heard, or not heard at all, was the universal pronunciation of the day: it was one of the regular weakenings of the popular use, which can be distinctly traced upon inscriptions through many centuries, and always on the increase: which was also prevalent among the different Italian dialects. Educated men of Virgil's day laboured to restore the *u*; and there can be no doubt that one effect of the Augustan literature was to stem to some extent the general corruption of the language as shewn in this and numerous other ways. Only these writers did not entirely debar themselves from the forms in daily use. Therefore their use of these vulgar forms was an infringement of their rule as poets, not such an infringement of some stricter non-poetical standard as is implied by the term "poetical licence." The *u* also fell out almost regularly in the secondary suffix *-ulo*, when preceded by *n*, or *r*, which then assimilated themselves to the following *l*, and so produced the terminations *-ello*, *-illo*, *-ollo*, *-ullo*; e. g. *ocellus* (for *ocululus*), *stella* (for *sterula*), *homullus* (for *homonulus*), *corolla* (for *coron-ula*), *stilla* for *stir-ula*: sometimes *-ulo* was added to a word in which it already occurred, with a similar result; as *pupillus* for *pupul-ulus* (that is *pupulo* + *ulo*, *oscillum* from *osculum*, &c.; see the lists given by Corssen²).

Loss of *e*;

Just as *u* fell out before *l*, so *e* was lost before *r*; especially in the suffixes *-ero*, *-bero*, &c. Thus we have *lib(e)ri*, *cap(e)ri*, *inf(e)ra*, *latē-b(e)ra*, and numerous others.

¹ *Bacch.* 968.

² II. 527—532.

Similarly the suffix *-tero* is weakened to *-tro*, as in *dextro*, *sinistro*, *neutro*, *nostro*; and then often to *-tri* as in *equestri-s*, &c.: so also *ac-ero* becomes *ac-ri-s*. And the same weakening which we have seen in *πατ(ε)ρός* is found in *pat(e)ris*, also in *ag(e)ri*, *aeg(e)ri*, *nig(e)ri*, *pig(e)ri*, &c. These are common and well known. Rather less obvious is the loss of *e* in *salictum*; compare *dumetum*, *quercetum*, &c. This vowel is also lost in perfects, like *ā* above: as *deb(e)ui*, *doc(e)ui*, *hab(e)ui*¹.

But the loss of all these vowels is small compared with that of *i*, the thinnest of all the vowels and most likely to die out; both when it was radical, and when it was the substitute for a stronger vowel. From the long list of its omissions², it seems capable of falling out of almost any place. Thus it disappears before *c* in *calx* (*calic-*); before *g* in *pur(i)gare*, *iur(i)gium*; before *d* in *cal(i)dus* (the true form of Augustus' day, on the authority of the Emperor himself³), *ual(i)de*, *u(u)idus*, *au(i)deo*, *gau(i)deo* (but *gaui-sus*); before *t* incessantly, as *miser(i)tus*, often in Lucretius in words which the next generation of writers did not allow to be contracted, as *pos(i)ta*⁴ (though the compound, *re-pos(i)tus*, is a favourite both of Virgil and Horace, and demands the weakening by its length); in *al(i)tus*, *quae-s(i)tor*, *audac(i)ter*, &c.; in the old verbs *fer(i)t*, *est* (i. e. *edit*), *uol(i)t*; (that is to say, if these forms did really employ the connecting vowels analogously to the other persons—*ferimus*, &c.): before *m* and *n* at the beginning of numerous suffixes, as *summus* for *supimus*, *bruma* for *brevima*, *teg(i)men*, *sig(i)num* (whence *siginulum* or *sigillum*), *alum(i)nus*, &c.—for the Graeco-Italian *e* in these formations probably passed through *i* before it was dropped, on the analogy of *terminus*, &c.; before *s* in comparative suffixes, if Corssen be right in his very ingenious suggestions

Loss of *i*;¹ Corssen, II. 540.² Ib. 542—573.³ Quint. I. 6. 19. The Emperor may at least be evidence to a form, even if he, like Sigismund, could not create it.⁴ I. 1059.

that, on the analogy of *magis, satis* (i. e. *magius, satius*), so also *mox* is a neuter comparative from *mouoc-ius* (\sqrt{mov}), whence *mouoc-is* and *mo(u)oc-s*, the *i* being dropped before the *s*; also that *uix* = *ui-c-ius*, a comparative of *ui-co-*, a secondary base formed from *uis*¹; as also the forms *als, ex, uls, su(b)s, &c.*, where the *s* is difficult to account for, and this (conjectural) explanation seems to me more probable than any other. It is certainly confirmed by the superlative forms in *-sto* (the Greek *-ιστο*): these are probably only the comparatives intensified by the addition of the pronominal base *-to*; then the *i* is traceable in *pra-is-to* or *praesto* "near," as "most before" you; it is lost in *iuata* for *iug-is-ta* "most joining on." The *i* is also lost before *s* as before *t* in verbal forms like *es, fers, &c.*

Much more numerous and important are the cases where *i* is lost in verbal formations before *s*, when another *s* precedes, which after the loss of course coalesces with the other. Such forms are *dixti* for *dic-si-sti*; which occurs very frequently in the comedians, but not again in literature till the Silver age. Similarly the subjunctive perfects *faxim*, for *fefaci-sim*, *ausim* for *ausi-sim*, the futura exacta *facso* for *fefaci-so*², *occepso* for *ob-cecapi-so*, the pluperfects *ex-stinxem* for *extinxi-sem*, *uixem* for *uixi-sem*, and the infinitives *dixe, traxe*—all shew the same loss. Schleicher indeed objects to these formations on the ground that the second *s* between two vowels must have become *r* and the *i* before it changed to *e*,

¹ See *Krit. Beiträge*, p. 62.

² The old explanation of these forms, that e.g. *faxo* was formed directly from \sqrt{fac} by adding *so*, as in Greek (see especially Madvig, *Opusc.* II. 64, &c.), is approved by Roby (*Grammar*, 198). It is to me improbable, (1) because if that method of forming the future had survived in Latin at all, we should surely have found more traces of it; (2) because the future suffix was *-sya*, and this should have appeared as *-sio* in Latin; (3) because compounds like *occepso* must be later than *capiam*, and yet they exhibit this assumed older form of the future suffix; (4) because these forms can hardly be separated from the subjunctives; (5) because *faxo*, at least, is unmistakably in use the future of the completed action. The objection, on the other hand, that *s* must have become *r* between two vowels is undoubtedly formidable: but I think the account given above gives some explanation of the difficulty, though it does not remove it.

as actually did take place in *fecerim*, which certainly followed the common Latin rule. Therefore he assumes¹ an older and a younger formation; and that in the older the suffix was added directly to the root, as *fac-sim*. This I think is improbable from the very periphrastic character of these tenses: compare the passive *factus sim*, where the first part is recognised as a complete word, not a mere root or even a base: and I think that the weak *i*, coming in the *third* syllable after a strong explosive sound, would scarcely be heard; and so the necessity for changing *s* to *r* would not be felt: afterwards when *fefaci* had sunk to *feci* the *i* would be more distinctly heard and affect the following *s* more. The history of these forms is the same as that of *uinclum* &c., mentioned above: they are found constantly in the comic writers who represent the pronunciation of ordinary life, and they were doubtless heard in ordinary talk in the Augustan age, and are therefore sometimes, but very rarely, used by Horace and Virgil. The other conjugations, the 1st, 2nd and 4th, could form their future perfect and subjunctive perfect in the same way from the earliest times down to the days of Ennius and Plautus, but not much later. Thus in Plautus we have *amasso* (i. e. *amawi-so*, which regularly became *amauero*), *seruasso*, *prohibessis* (i. e. *prohibei-sis* or *prohibueris*). Here it would seem that the loss of the *u* as well as the *i* led to a compensatory doubling of the *s*².

The cases in which the vowels have fallen out in composition are sufficiently numerous and peculiar to deserve a short separate notice³. The stronger vowels indeed did

It is especially lost in compounds.

¹ *Comp.* p. 831.—Corssen assumes, to account for these forms, an indicative perfect *faxi*, i. e. *fac + si*, a later form and distinct from *feci* whence *fecerim* (= *feci-sim*). Such perfects no doubt often occurred; but here I prefer to derive both forms from a reduplicated perfect, which occurs in the Oscan, *fefaci*. This can be weakened in two ways, one as in the text, the other by dropping the *a*, through the stress being on the reduplicated syllable *fef(a)ci*, *fe(f)ci*, *feci*.

² See, however, Roby, *Grammar*, p. 198.

³ For a fuller list of examples, see Corssen, ii. 573—587.

CH. VII.

not fall out under these circumstances, at least without first sinking to a lower sound: *co-ago*, doubtless, first became *coigo* on the analogy of *red-igo*, &c. and so passed to *cogo*. And most of the instances in which *o* seems to have fallen out, appear to me rather cases of contraction, e.g. *quorsum* from *quo-uorsum*, where we have a sliding together of the double *uo*, than an elision of either: this is true also of *prosa* for *pro-uorsa*, and Corssen's assumed *mouox*; of *co(i)uncti* and *ho(i)ornus* where the lost letter was *y*: in all these cases the vowels which met were the cognate *o* and *u* which easily united. The loss of *u* is singularly rare; it is apparently confined to the last syllable of *manu* in compounds like *man(u)suetus*, *man(u)datus*, *man(u)ceps*, &c. the length of these words rendered the loss of some part inevitable, and therefore the unaccented vowel was naturally the first to go. The loss of *e* and *i* is common enough. Thus *e* is lost in *ol(e)facio*, *nuncupo*, i.e. *nomen-cupo*, *posse* for *pot(e)se*: in numerals often with a consonant, as *quin(que)decim*, *sept(em)ussis*, &c. Its loss in the reduplicated perfects is well known, e.g. in *rec(e)cidi*, *ret(e)tuli*. In all these cases the first part of the compound has suffered: the loss has fallen on the second member in *prae(he)ndo*, *co-u(e)ntio* (which finally sank to *contio*, like *noui-uentius* to *nuntius*), in *bi-(ge)nae*, *mali(g)e(nus)* and numerous others. The loss of *i* is commoner still; e.g. *au(i)-spex*, *nau(i)fragus*, *un(i)decim*, *sinciput* for *semi-caput*, *officina* for *opi-ficina*, *pau(ci)-per*, *sti(pi)-pendium* and others; in the second part of the compounds, as *su-r(i)go*, *co-(i)mo*, *sur-(ri)pui*, *re-pos(i)-tus*, &c., *iur(i)gium*, *prae(i)tor*, *indu-(i)tiae*, *praebeo* for *prae-hibeo*, *iubeo* perhaps for *ius-hibeo*, &c.

What was
the imme-
diate cause
of this
loss?

The ultimate cause of the loss of a vowel in so many Latin words is the general principle of all phonetic change. But the question naturally rises why particular syllables have suffered to such an extent while others have escaped scot-free. It can hardly be doubted that the syllable which has lost its vowel must have been in each word one

on which no stress fell: and Corssen has instituted an elaborate inquiry¹ into the laws of the Latin accent in order to shew that the accent must have been borne either by the preceding or the following syllable. I have already spoken of the difficulty inherent in such an explanation; namely, that we cannot be sure whether classical "accent" meant increase of pitch or of force, or both combined²: at all events Corssen has confused the two³. As for Greek, so for Latin, he assumes an older law of accentuation which is *à priori* not improbable. The younger law rests on the authority of Priscian and Servius; the assumed older one rests on particular forms of words which will not fit in with this later law—words in which syllables which should have been pronounced according to that law with a higher tone or with greater stress than the others, have yet lost their vowel altogether. Some of Corssen's evidence will be given briefly in a note at the end of this chapter⁴. It is valid on any one of these three hypotheses: (1) that the "accent" denoted greater force in the pronunciation of the accented syllable; which I do not believe: (2) that if it was a pitch-accent, it could obscure the vowel of an adjacent syllable; which is very uncertain: (3) that force and pitch sometimes coincided, and so affected the next syllable; which cannot be proved, but is extremely likely.

It is not probable that the vowels thus lost fell out abruptly, with no intermediate step. Before a short vowel finally vanished it commonly passed through a stage in which it was scarcely heard though still written, retained without possessing any definite quantity and liable therefore to be pronounced more or less distinctly according to chance of position. Such vowels accordingly had not the

Middle stage between a vowel fully sounded and entirely lost.

¹ II. 794—947.

² See page 213.

³ See note on page 314.

⁴ In previous editions I gave a long abstract of Corssen's theory in the text (p. 297, ed. 2). As I now regard the whole question as very uncertain and much in need of fuller investigation, I have thought it better to give in a note only so much of Corssen's argument as is unaffected by his confusion of pitch and force.

full length of a short vowel, for scanning, and therefore could be ignored at the pleasure of the writer, whether they occurred in enclitics, as *ipse, est, quidem*, &c., or in the grave syllable of accented words, as *vóluptas, mánu, béně*, &c. Further, such a vowel could be disregarded even before two consonants, as *seněctúti*¹, *ferěntárium*, &c.²; also, when a word ended with a consonant which was weakly sounded, such as *m, n, s, t, d*, and the next word began with a consonant, the vowel before the final consonant if weak itself was not lengthened by "position." These facts are conclusively proved by Corssen, by numerous examples³ from the Latin dramatists, who give us the best evidence of the common pronunciation of the day: to these vanishing vowels he gives the name "irrational." This then is the cause of the apparent irregularities in the lines of Plautus and Terence; which are regular enough if we do not apply the standard of Greek metre to them. In these writers such vowels (following the analogy of the spoken language) are *dumb* although written. But this license was impossible in the regular metrical system of the Augustan poets. They could not brook these syllables which were neither alive nor dead. For them every vowel must be a full long, or a full short, or cease to exist altogether: they could not make up one short syllable out of two or three half-heard ones. Consequently they either struck out the lingering vowel-sound altogether, as in *dextra*, or raised it to a full short, as *dextera*; they could not leave it ambiguous as *dextěra*, where the vowel was heard indeed, but did not take up the time of a full short. It was

¹ Plaut. *Trin.* 398.² *Id.* 456.³ II. 608—669. For a long list of similar examples, see the excellent edition of the *Trinummus*, by Brix, Intr. p. 16.

The short vowel before doubled consonants in Plautus, e.g. *simillimae, Philippum*, is not parallel. These are to be explained by the well-known fact that the double consonant was not *written* before the days of Attius, and therefore the sound wavered between a long and a short, but was probably always distinctly heard. So also in words like *uxor, seněx, Alexander*, the reason of the apparently irregular shortening is, that *x* did not sound much more than *s*.

no doubt especially the introduction into Rome of the dactylic metre, which favoured short syllables, that stopped in written Latin the ever-increasing vowel-corruption, and fixed the vocalism at that point which it had reached at Cicero's time. But the spoken Latin was being further corrupted none the less: its downward path must be traced through the vernaculars and into the Romance dialects.

The explanation of the extensive corruption and loss of vowels in the Latin—that it was caused by the vowel gradually dying out of emphasised syllables—seems to me the most probable. It is given, though unsatisfactorily, as I have said, by Corssen; it is also given by Ritschl¹, though a different view was taken by him in the *Prolegomena* to the *Trinummus*; by Dr Wagner in the admirable Introduction to his edition of the *Aulularia*, the first attempt with which I am acquainted to make known in England the process and results of etymological research in Germany; and by Prof. Munro, in a review of Dr Wagner's book². The opposite view was formerly held by Ritschl, that the words were compressed in the utterance, e. g. that *manus* was sounded as *mnus* (not as *manus*, with the last syllable "dumb"); similarly that we should pronounce *sneæ*, *sror* for *senex*, *soror*, &c.³. This theory is often supported by instances like *père*, *mère*, &c. in French, where the *t* is supposed to have fallen out through this compression of the total sound⁴. But the reference to French to prove the pronunciation of Latin, seems to me just as deceptive as to argue from modern to ancient Greek. This theory is much less adapted than the other to the genius of the Latin language, which, as we have

¹ See *Rheinisches Museum*, xiv. 400.

² *Camb. Univ. Gazette*, April 28, 1869.

³ In the first edition of this work I wrongly attributed this view to Prof. Key. He writes: "In my 'Comments' on a pamphlet by Dr Donaldson (then Mr D.) published in 1845, I expressed my dissent from Bentley's doctrine (ad. Ter. Eun. 2, 3, 66) that *senex* should be read as *s'nex*." I owe Prof. Key an apology for this error.

⁴ It is, I think, more truly explained by Wagner (*Aul.* Introd. p. xxxiv. note) as having been assimilated to the *r*.

CH. VII.

Loss in
and of the
final syllable
arising from
its never
being ac-
cented.

Loss in
quantity.

seen already in part, and shall now see more fully, produces above all things corruption of the *last* syllable.

For I come now to the loss of the final syllable, both when the vowel itself ends the word, and when it is followed by an imperfectly sounded consonant, which was lost either before, or with the vowel: as the principle is the same in both cases, they may be considered both together. I thought it better to defer these until I had stated a probable reason for them, because the examples are mostly familiar, but may now be all referred to one principle. Often where the vowel is not absolutely lost, it has suffered loss of quantity from the same general cause; I must therefore for the sake of completeness briefly consider this loss also, though I have not now time to enter fully into the history of Latin prosody; a good account of which (so far as Plautus at least is concerned) will be found in Wagner's *Aulularia*, and Brix's *Trinummus*.

The loss in quantity as the slighter loss will naturally come first: and here let us first look at those cases where the vowel of the last syllable has been shortened, although the final consonant was not lost, but probably indistinctly pronounced—a point which will come under our notice when we treat of consonantal change. Thus, *ā*, *ē*, *ī* were long in the verbal bases *amā*, *monē*, *audī*, and as they are still found long in the second person *amās*, &c. were no doubt once always long in the third also, *amāt*, &c. Yet instances are hardly to be found of the vowel occurring long, even in Plautus¹: on the contrary, the syllable is commonly short: though oddly enough there are several instances of *ā* in the imperfect, even in classical Latin; where the unusual length is generally explained by the editors as simply the result of arsis: I have already said that “metrical licence” is most foreign to the spirit of the Augustan poetry: and we should never have found e.g. *amittebāt*² if the old long-sound of the *ā* had not been

¹ Corssen quotes *Merc.* 648, ‘Quid istuc captas consilium? Quia enim me addicit amor.’

² *Aen.* v. 853.

sometimes heard in the speech of the day. Examples of the vowel being still long in the present in the Augustan age are *arāt*¹, *ridēt*², *uidēt*³. For the subjunctive we have *fuāt*, *augeāt*, &c. in Plautus and Terence; the *ā* being afterwards shortened by the general tendency to weaken the final syllable. Similarly Horace has *perirēt*⁴. Curiously even the *i* in the third conjugation is found long in *figūt*⁵ and *facīt*⁶ and others. Wagner compares the Greek e.g. *λέγει*⁷; and therefore, I suppose, regards the lengthening as compensatory: but it may be on a mistaken analogy. The perfect has its third person long more frequently, as *astitit*⁸, &c., and compare the end of one line of the epitaph of Scipio, "hic fuīt apud uos." In the second person of the subjunctive perfect, the *i* seems hardly more short than long in the Augustan age. Examples of the long *a* in the present are *loquār*, *opprimār*⁹, &c. Passing from verbs to nouns, we see in Plautus the final still long of *sorōr*, *stultiōr*¹⁰, &c.; though the *o* is elsewhere short in *soror* and similar words, as might be inferred from the process of weakening which gradually reduced the full long vowel to something less than a short. Hannibāl was still long with Ennius, as Corssen suggests¹¹, because the name was derived from the Phœnician Baal, and was naturally long, and afterwards shortened by the prevailing Latin tendency. Lastly, *-būs* (originally *bhyas*) in the dative plural is long in Plautus¹²: and rarely in Virgil¹³.

¹ Hor. *Od.* III. 16. 26.² *Id.* II. 6. 14.

³ *Aen.* I. 308.—Prof. Munro, in a note to Lucr. II. 27, denies that there is any analogy between *fulgēt* there (and similar long forms in Virgil) and the lengthening of such syllables in Ennius. But at all events Virgil would not have lengthened such a syllable if it had not been long in Ennius; there is at least so much analogy: and if my principle be correct, the vowel cannot have been wholly short in the common speech even of Virgil's day; or he would not have used it as long. That such long syllables are only found in arsis in Virgil, and not in thesis as in Ennius, is natural enough, for no doubt the tendency to shorten the final syllable, when not emphasised, had increased greatly between the days of Ennius and Virgil.

⁴ *Od.* III. 5. 17.⁵ Hor. *Od.* III. 24. 5.⁶ Virg. *Ecl.* VII. 23.⁷ *Introd.* p. xix.⁸ Plaut. *Mil.* 213.⁹ Plaut. *Amph.* 559, and 1056.¹⁰ *Poen.* I. 2. 151. *Bacch.* 123.¹¹ I. 366.¹² E.g. *Aul.* 376.¹³ E.g. in *Aen.* IV. 64.

CH. VII.

Loss of
quantity
when the
final con-
sonant was
lost.

When the final consonant was not merely weakly sounded but absolutely lost, the tendency to shorten the preceding vowel was still stronger. The vowel remained unguarded, to suffer the wear and tear of use, and was affected in the same way as originally final letters. Here, as in the cases mentioned above, vowels which were generally long in the days of Plautus and his contemporaries were shortened in the common speech in the last century before Christ—so much so, that they were generally scanned as such by Virgil and Horace, though the older quantity occasionally still appears in their times, breaking the regularity of the Greek metres they employed. Some words retained their concluding vowel long to a late period. When the *d* of the ablative was lost, final *a* none the less retained its length till the times of the later Empire. One exception is *itā*, which is long in Naevius' well-known line,

Itāque postquamst Orci traditus thesauro.

But final *ē* commonly sank to *ĕ*, as *patrĕ*; though we have on Scipio's tomb,

Gnauod patrē prognatus, fortis uir sapiensque.

Traces are found of a middle form *eĭ*, as in Ennius' line;

Tum caua sub montei late specus intus patebat.

Long *ē* was retained in *mē* and *tē* from *mēd* and *tēd*: whilst the ablative of the third pronoun kept the *d* but shortened the vowel, and appeared as *sēd*, literally "by itself:" its original length is shewn in compounds like *sēd-ītio*. Adverbs in *-e*, originally ablatives in *-ed*, generally remained long, except short words in common use, as *bene*, *male*, and a few trisyllables, where the accent fell on the penultima, as *inférne*¹, *supérne*. Similarly *quē* was originally *quīd*, then *quī*, *quē* (by the tendency mentioned above to change a final vowel into *e*) and *quē*²: the form

¹ Lucr. vi. 597.

² The correspondence in meaning with the vulgar English "which" is comical. When Virgil said "*Arma uirumque cano*," "arms I sing,

quā is found frequently in the comic writers with a transitional sense in exclamations¹: and compare the long *i* in *quintīdie*, *postrīdie*, &c. Then *modō*, whilst still used as the ablative of *modus*, is shortened by Plautus²: so also *cito* and *ergo*, adverbs, though the latter is not commonly shortened till the Silver age, when numerous examples of final *o* shortened are found³; which would have been inadmissible in classical Latin, but which were daily growing more numerous in common speech in the days of the classical poets. In fact the Augustan authors used the short final *o* only in words which had been so completely worn down by common use that no feeling of their old length remained, such as *citō*, *modō*, *homō* and *egō*, shortened from *homōn* and *egōn*. A huge list of words ending in *ō*, which are found in Juvenal and Martial—who no doubt reflect the common pronunciation of the day—is given by Corssen, from whom indeed nearly all the examples I have quoted above are taken⁴.

Next, the loss in Latin terminations is to be seen in the shortening of originally final vowels. Thus the *ā* of the feminine nominative was early shortened, leaving but few traces of itself in Ennius and Plautus⁵; and sometimes certainly in inscriptions, as in the grand line on the tomb

*Loss of
quantity in
originally
final
vowels.*

which I sing the man," he was unconsciously using the exact idiom of Mrs Gamp and Peaceman X. The originative power of language is limited after all.

In the first edition I said that the lengthening of *quē* in Virgil was due to the original length being retained in the consciousness of language. I now am convinced by Prof. Munro's arguments (on *Latin Prosody*, in *Public School Latin Grammar*, p. 460) that here at least Virgil was merely copying the Homeric lengthening of *re*: he points out that in fifteen out of the sixteen cases where it occurs it is in the arsis of the second foot, e.g. *liminaquē laurusque Dei*: in the other case it is in the arsis of the fifth, *Noemonaquē Prytanisque*; and it is always the first of two consecutive *quē*'s.

¹ E.g. *Trin.* 464; see Brix's note.

² *Aul.* 589. See Wagner's *Introduction*, p. xxii.

³ E.g. in Juvenal, *ponō* (vii. 93), *vigilandō* (iii. 232); and numerous others both in this author and in Martial.

⁴ Corssen, ii. 486.

⁵ *As.* 762, *epistulā*: *Bacch.* 255, "Volcanus, Sol, Lunā, Dies, Di quattuor:" unless we follow Fleckeisen and transpose Sol and Luna, for which there seems no occasion.

of the young L. Cornelius Scipio¹,

Quoiei uitā defecit, non honos, honore.

In locatives we find *ī* in *domī*², and others in Plautus: *mihi*, &c. could have the final vowel short or long down to the Augustan age; compare *nisi* and *quasi*. Imperative dissyllables early shortened the last vowel, as was but natural, to the brevity of command: *rogā*, *iubē*, *manē*, &c. are frequent in Plautus: also other (not imperative) forms, as *darī*, *dedī*, because of their shortness and frequency: *o* also in the first person is short in *eō* and *volō*—dissyllables again, and found in Plautus, but in the Silver age the tendency had affected longer verbs as well.

Loss of
letters in
the final
syllable.

We now come lastly to the absolute loss of the vowel, either when it stands actually last, or when it is followed only by a weakly-sounded consonant, that is, practically, by none at all—the result, like the loss of quantity already considered, of the tendency in Latin to throw back the accent as far as possible from the end of the word, subject to the rule of the length of the penultima. First under this head comes the loss of original *o*, or later *u*, in the nominatives, such as *ager(os)*, *puer(os)*, &c., a numerous class; as *famul* for *famul(os)* used by Lucretius³ after Ennius,

Ossa dedit terrae proin ac famul infimus esset.

It is not easy to determine in these cases whether the vowel or the *s* went first: we should rather have expected the *s*; but there are no traces of the vowel surviving: on the contrary, *s* is found alone in words like *Campans*⁴, but this seems almost unique. But the vowel *i* has certainly fallen out and left the *s* in nouns like *Arpina(ti)s*, where the *t* after the loss of the vowel would seem to have assimilated itself to the *s*; so in *men(ti)s*, *fron(di)s*, and

¹ Mommsen, *Corpus*, n. 34.

² *Mil.* 194.

³ *III.* 1035.

⁴ Plaut. *Trin.* 545, quoted by Corssen, II. 591.

very many others: in *orb(i)s*, &c. where the preceding consonant is not a dental, it keeps its place unchanged. Where a liquid precedes, the liquid maintains its ground, and the *s* is lost, e.g. *uigil(is)*, *uomer(is)*, *pedester(is)*, and very many others; where however the accent falling on the antepenultima sometimes drove out the *e* of the next syllable, and produced the other form, as *pedestris*. The same principle seems to have produced out of *uelis* (i. e. *si uelis*) the conjunctive *uel*¹.

I followed by no consonant fell away regularly in neuter nominatives, such as *animal(i)*, *lacunar(i)*, *cochlear(i)*, *pipper(i)*, *lac(ti)*: though Corssen mentions forms in *-e*, as *lacunare*, existing side by side with these, as was quite natural; he quotes *sale* (i. e. *sal*) from Ennius. Similarly in many adverbs the *i* has been lost, as *tot(i)*, *ut(i)*, *post(i)*, &c. For *tot* and *quot* Corssen compares the Sanskrit *tati* and *kati*, and calls *ti* a "demonstrative particle:" but *tati* seems to be rather an old locative form produced by adding *i* to the pronominal base *tat*. The *i* was lost in very old times from the verbal terminations, as *regis(i)*, *regit(i)*, *regont(i)*; also from *regebām(i)*.

E was lost in imperatives of the third or old conjugation, just as *ā* and *ē* were shortened in the first and second: e.g. in *dic(e)*, *fac(e)*: but the full forms are common in Plautus: this loss therefore was a late one. Many little words in common use have lost their final *e*, as *neu(e)*, originally *ne uelis*, *hic(e)*, &c.; *nec* (i. e. *necquī* or *nequē*), *qui-n(e)*, *si-n(e)*, &c. The fuller forms, *hice*, *hæ-ce*, the nom. plur. *hisce*, &c. are sometimes still to be seen in Plautus. This *e*, which was in these cases weakened from *i*, must have been so slight a sound, and so little inconvenient at the end of a word, that it is lost less frequently than we might have expected.

¹ Corssen, II. 60, ed. 1. Dr Wagner (*Academy*, July 11, 1870) prefers Prof. Key's explanation that *uel* = *uol*, an obsolete imperative. It seems to me that in *si-ue* and *ne-ue* the first part of the word suits better with the explanation given in the text.

NOTE TO CHAPTER VII.

Common
law of ac-
centuation.

By the rules of accentuation of the Roman literary period we find

1. *Monosyllables.*

vowel long by nature.

..... short¹

2. *Dissyllables.*

last vowel long.

..... short, and first short.

..... long.

3. *Trisyllables, or more.*

penult short.

.....long (position).

..... (nature), and last long.

..... short.

Circumflexed.

rēs
fōns
sōl
fiēs

Acute.

mél
cór
fáx
nóx

Rómae
népos
árma
déus

Róma
dōnum

áscia
póstulas
puélla
tegéntes
pudícae
audísses

lectíca
ciuílis

The circumflex or "broken high tone," as Corssen calls it, was not the same tone throughout; *prima erecta rursus in grauem flectitur*, as Servius defines it. And this sinking of the tone is doubtless the reason why it is never found separated from the end of the word by more than one short syllable. Its natural place therefore would seem to be at the very end. Yet so little was the Latin inclined to accentuate the last syllable, that the circumflex is never found upon it in dissyllables, except when the original last syllable has been wholly or partially

¹ That is *naturally* short, and lengthened (for prosody) only by position. Natural length is either radical, as in *stāre*; or the result of vowel-intensification, as *dūcti*, or of contraction, as *amās*. Mere length by position, in words like *nox*, *arma*, &c. must be distinguished from this.

lost, as in *illic(e)*, *credôn(e)*, and the similar *nostrâ(ti)s*, *andî(ui)t*.

Loss therefore may be expected in unaccentuated syllables : that is, on all *original* final syllables (which actually did suffer most severely) ; in the syllable immediately *before* the accented syllable (and we have seen the loss of the vowel in many such ; in *c(a)larus*, *c(a)lamor*, *text(o)rina*, *pist(o)rina*, *discip(u)lina*, *lib(e)rare*, *fab(e)rica*, *pat(e)ronus*, *cer(e)ritus*, *cal(i)care*, *pur(i)-gare*, *teg(i)mentum*, or at least in the simpler forms from which these are derived) ; and in the penultima when *following* the accent (as we saw in *pal(a)ma*, *vinc(u)lum*, *peric(u)lum*, *lib(e)ri*, *ded(e)rot*, *no(ue)ram*, *quaes(i)tor*, *uol(i)tis*, &c.).

But by this law we cannot account for occasional weakenings like *uict(ō)rix*, &c. ; Here accent and quantity ought to have agreed to preserve the *ō* ; and yet it is absolutely lost. To explain this and many other such difficulties Corssen assumes an older law of accentuation, differing from that in common use in two main points.

*Assumed
older law.*

1. *The accent was not bound by the length of the penultima.* This will account for cases where a penultimate vowel, long by nature or position, on which by the latter rule the accent must have fallen, has been either absolutely lost, as *crép(a)vi*, *vîct(o)-rix*, *sû(buo)rsum*, *dédrot* (for *déderunt*), *dîx(is)ti*, &c., or shortened, as *fîdèi* (from *fîdêis*), *îllius*, *hômînis*, *plátêa*, *dócêo*, *dédîmus*, in all of which the penultima was once undoubtedly long. The same applies to compounds, like *côgnîtus*, *pêîëro*, &c. ; and to the manifold cases where the quality of the vowel is weakened though the original quantity is retained, as in *ânêlo*, *înquîro*, *âccûso* ; or in *côndemno*, *înermis*, where the vowel is long by position.

2. *The accent might fall even on the fourth syllable from the end.* This possibility will account for cases where the antepenultima has fallen out, though by the usual law it ought to have borne the accent : e.g. in *îûr(i)gium*, *gáu(i)deo*, *puér(i)tia*, *póp(u)licus*, *sûr(ri)puit*, *dé(hi)beo*, *rét(e)tulit*, and countless others. Another effect was the loss of the final vowel or syllable, as *ânimâl(e)*, *frûgifer(os)*, *ôpîfex*, i. e. *ôpîfic(i)s*.

Sometimes we seem to see side by side the results of this method, and those of the later rule, long after that one had

CH. VII.

become general : e. g. *ánimae* besides *animái* from *animáis*, *déderimus* by *dederimus* : so also in trisyllables *dédērunt* by *dedērunt*. Such double forms would shew the length of the contest : in which the later method was perhaps assisted by the new acquaintance with Greek laws of accentuation : but which certainly dated from an earlier time, as is shewn by the numerous syncopated forms in Plautus, and seems even to have been as old as the XII. Tables.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSONANTAL-CHANGE.

IN the last chapter I have mentioned, I think, the most important variations of the Greek and of the Latin vowel-system from that of their common Graeco-Italian ancestors, and from the simple vocalism of the earliest historic period of our race. We have seen in these variations the strength of the Greek and the weakness of the Italian. We have seen how the Greek could adhere in the main to the simple distinction of scales in the original vowel-system, and yet could avail itself with remarkable success of any expansion of that system. The Greek vocalism shews the greatest observance of rule, combined with the greatest individuality: and thus coincides with the highest development of Greek character to a surprising degree: and since the consonantal system shews the same principle, though developed in a less degree and in different ways, we are justified in believing that the character of a nation can be impressed on its language, so far as that language is the result of pure internal development, and has not been compounded of many foreign elements. The Italian, on the contrary, both confounded that distinction of the three main vowels which is essential for the clear expression of distinct radical ideas, and also subjected itself to a rule which kept ever increasing in stringency—the tendency to uniform monotonous weakening. So far then we have seen the Greek at its best, the Latin at its worst. Now we shall see the better side of the Latin compared with the Greek, shewn in its greater tenacity of consonantal sound. No doubt the Latin not unfrequently substituted a weaker for a stronger consonant, as well as the

CH. VIII.

Superiority of the Greek over the Latin thus far manifested.

Greater strength of the Latin consonants.

CH. VIII.

Greek or indeed any other language: every language has its own peculiar weakenings of this kind; they are the most obvious marks of distinction between one language and another. But the greater strength of the Latin consonants is shewn in their comparative freedom from assimilation, which in many Greek verbs obscures the radical form. Thus in *φράσσω* we have the same root and the same suffix (*ya*) as in the Latin *farc-īo*: but the *k* of the root is lost in Greek from the assimilating effect of the *y*, which in Latin was simply resolved into the cognate vowel, and exercised no power over the stronger consonant: indeed the *k* is hardly recoverable in Greek because it has regularly sunk to *γ*, as in *ἔφραγον*; just as it sank to *bairg* in Gothic, that language which of all the Indo-European family comes nearest to the Greek in the richness of its vowel-system: the original *k* is to be discovered in the less spiritual Latin and Lithuanian. Generally speaking, however, the original form is recoverable in Greek from some of the tenses which are formed directly from the root: the Greeks felt too keenly the necessity of clearness to suffer the consonants to be absolutely obliterated; they are the necessary framework of language, the body which is needed for the soul; yet the soul may be vigorous though many bodily members are weak or even lost. It is curious too how the innate Greek love of symmetry is recognisable even in the weakenings of its consonants: they are nearly always regular, not often isolated: there is a system to be found in almost all of them: while the Latin looks uneven in the midst of its regularity; its loss especially of consonants in groups is arbitrary, and not reducible to rule: and even its less corrupted vowel-forms have a more irregular appearance than those of the Greek. Nothing can look more regular than *ἔζομαι*, *στίζω*, *σχιζω*, *μύζω*, &c.; but this regularity leaves us quite uncertain whether the root ends in a guttural or a dental; while there is no such uncertainty about the very unsymmetrical forms which correspond to them in Latin, *sedeo*, *stinguo*,

scindo, mugio. This will appear more clearly when we have seen the difference in the changes of the two languages.

I. SUBSTITUTION.

1. Change of hard (unaspirated) letters to soft.

I have already pointed out¹ that this change may be not simple substitution, but may be due in all cases (as it certainly is in some) to the assimilating effect of the adjoining vowels on the consonant. But as I do not think that the point is quite clear, I still leave the cases under this head, not under that of Assimilation. The change is not very common in either language, and less so in Latin than in Greek: in both languages it is sporadic only, never affecting the whole, even of any class of words.

Thus κ passes into γ in ἀρήγω from $\sqrt{\alpha\rho\kappa}$, which is unaltered in ἄρκιος. Here the κ is clearly subject to the softening influence of the two vowels and of ρ . I have already mentioned the Greek ἔφραγον by the side of *farcio*; but the $\sigma\sigma$ of φράσσω shews that $\sqrt{\phi\rho\alpha\kappa}$ must have been the original form: for we should have had φράζω from a $\sqrt{\phi\rho\alpha\gamma}$. Indeed the Latin has commonly preserved for us the original letter which the Greek has weakened. Thus in Greek we have πήγνυμι, and even in Latin we find *pagus*: but *pac-iscor* shews that the oldest form of this common root, to fix—whence to build, or to covenant—was PAK, and not PAG, as we should have rather supposed from the frequency of the *g*: and πάσσαλος (i. e. πακ-γα-λο-ς) tells the same tale. Compare μίσγω and *misceo*².

In Latin *gloria* is from \sqrt{klu} , the Indo-European KRU; the first step is the noun *clouos* (compare κλέφος), which with the suffix *ya* becomes the secondary noun *clouosia*;

Change of
hards to
softs—not
very com-
mon.

Change of
K to γ and
to g.

¹ See page 83.

² A full list of all the gutturals thus changed in Greek is given in the *Gr. Et.* 485—487.

CH. VIII.

and this, by the loss of *u* and the change of *s* to *r*, is *cloria*; after which the *l* is probably responsible for the *g*¹. But there is no such cause to account for *viginti* by the side of *Fíkari* (Attic *εἰκοσι*) and *guberno* (*κυβερνάω*); whilst the variation within the Latin itself is seen in *gurgulio* by the Plautine *curculio*². The older *k* is pointed out by Corssen (l. c.) as often found in the Old Umbrian, where the Latin had weakened it.

Peculiar
change of
the hard
guttural in
Latin.

But this change of sound in Latin is, doubtless, connected with a curious and well-ascertained fact in the history of the Latin alphabet. The Old Latin alphabet had, like the Greek, *κ* for the hard guttural, *c* or *<* (Greek *Γ*) for the soft. But the difference between the two sounds was nearly lost at some early period, and consequently the symbol *κ* fell out of use: it was only retained occasionally before *a*, though it was regularly kept as the abbreviated form of some words, as *K(aeso)*, *K(alendae)*, &c.; whilst *c*, not *g*, is found in old inscriptions in forms like *macister*, *cnata*, &c.; *leciones* stands on the restored Columna Rostrata: *C.* and *Cn.* were used till quite late for *Gaius* and *Gnaeus*. In fact, the *k*-sound was lost for a time, and *k* and *g* alike were represented by *c*, that is, by the *g*-sound. But at a later date, some time in the third century B. C., the distinction of sound begins to reappear, as Corssen suggests very probably³, from the increasing intercourse of Rome with foreign peoples, especially the Greeks of southern Italy. But instead of replacing *κ* for the hard guttural sound, the Romans kept the existing symbol *c* for the hard sound, and then slightly modified it by the small line in *g* to denote the soft sound⁴. That the rather frequent change from *k* to *g* in Latin is due in great measure to the confusion of the symbols, seems to me probable, from the fact that for the other classes there is less corre-

¹ See *Krit. Beitr.* 53.

² Corssen, i. 77.

³ i. 10.

⁴ The earliest place where *g* certainly occurs seems to be the tombstone of Scipio Barbatus, about 200 B. C. Corssen, *ib.*

sponding weakening; to which indeed the Latin had no great leaning. The change of κ or c into qv will be considered in the next chapter; also its weakening under some particular circumstances into a palatal sound like *ch*, which arises from assimilation.

The hard dental passes into the soft much more rarely, even in Greek. We find δάπις¹, which seems to be the same as τάπ-ης. It is at least probable that the curious word νέποδες² is the same as *nepōtes*, the shortening of the *o* being due probably to the confusion by the grammarians with πόδες: whereas Curtius rightly, I think, derives both from the root *NAP*, whence come so many words denoting relationship: ἀνέψ-ιος, "a cousin," the Sanskrit *naptar*, "a grandson," the Norse *nefi*, "a brother," and our "nephew;" a rather remarkable list of different "specialisations" in different languages. That the groups πτ and κτ have sunk to βδ and γδ in ἔβδομος and ὄγδοος from ἑπτὰ and ὀκτώ seems equally undeniable and difficult to explain³.

In Latin it is probable (as Corssen asserts⁴) that there is no instance of *t* sinking to *d* at the beginning of a word or between two vowels. The confusion between *t* and *d* at the end of a word (shewn in the different spellings of the best MSS., *aput* and *apud*, *haut* and *haud*, *set* and *sed*, &c.) belongs rather to the universal weakness of Latin terminations. The rule that the prepositions ended in *d*, and the conjunctions in *t*, seems to rest neither on etymological grounds nor on the actual inscriptions⁵; rather the final letter of these words, which were enclitic and fell constantly under one accent with the following word, was assimilated by the initial letter. Assimilation is the cause of *quattuor* turning into *quadraginta*: the numerals both in Latin and Greek constantly shew

Change of
T to *δ* and
d.

¹ Arist. *Vesp.* 676.

² *Od.* iv. 404. Theok. xvii. 25. See *Gr. Et.* No. 342 and p. 489.

³ Curtius (*Gr. Et.* 488) thinks that *o* in ἔβδομος was irrational, and that the *μ* assimilated the *τ*, and that in time the *π*.

⁴ *Krit. Beitr.* 83 et seq.

⁵ Corssen, i. 191, &c.

CH. VIII.

Change of
P to β and
υ.

us odd variations of sound, so that their identification must sometimes depend, as it may safely here, on sameness of meaning.

For the change from π to β Curtius gives about a dozen more or less certain examples, of which perhaps the best are ὕβρις which seems to be derived from ὑπέρ, and καλυβή, compared with καλύπτω¹; compare Latin *clupeus*; the π may be the mark of a secondary root KALP from KAL: ἄβ-ρός and ἄπ-αλός are probably akin: and since there is no reason for hardening in στίλπ-νός, it is most likely that the β in στίλβω is a weakened π.

There are rather more examples in the Latin. *Bibo* is certainly a weakened reduplicated form of PA, "to drink:" the Greek has preserved the consonant but weakened the vowel to υ. *Scabillum* too may be compared with √σκαπ in σκῆπ-τρον, &c. and *glaber* with γλαφυρός². This weakening however is especially remarkable in words borrowed at an early date from the Greek, as *Burrus* for Πύρρος, *carbasus* for κάρπασος. At a later period *p* is not changed in words similarly borrowed: and this weakening of *p* into *b*, in connection with that of *k* to *g* mentioned above, may perhaps shew, as Corssen suggests, that the Romans just before their more extended intercourse with foreign nations had not a good ear for the distinction between hard and soft momentary sounds: a distinction which under Greek influence they afterwards recovered.

2. Further substitution for momentary (unaspirated) sounds.

Such substitution seems to be confined to one or two cases in Latin. In Greek there is little further change of these letters which does not seem to belong clearly to assimilation. In Latin the only letter which is much affected is *d*. This sometimes passes into *l* and *r*. The first change takes place commonly at the beginning of a word: thus *leuir* = the Greek δαήρ, and the originality of

¹ *Gr. Et.* 489, &c.

² Corssen, i. 128.

Change of
D to l in
Latin.

the *d* is shewn by the Sanskrit *dēvar*. That *lingua* was originally *dīngua* is probable from the Gothic *tuggô*, our "tongue." And *dacrima* as the older form of *lacrima* (corresponding to *δάκρυ*, and Gothic *tagr*, a "tear") was used by Livius Andronicus, according to Festus, and probably, as Bergk suggests, by Ennius in his famous lines:

nemo me dacrūmis decorēt neque funera fletu
faxit. Cur? uolito uiuos per ora uirom.

The argument from alliteration seems irresistible. It is possible that *lignum* may be from a root DAGH, to burn, in Sanskrit *√dah*: the change from *a* to *i* before gutturals is rather common in Latin; compare *ignis*, *tignum*, &c. There are some rare but undoubted examples of the same change between two vowels: as *olere*, *ol(e)facere*, &c. from *√od*, which is found in *odor* and in *ὀδῶδα*. *Ulysses* of course represents *Ὀδυσσεύς*. If *adepts* be the equivalent of *ἀλειφα*, we have the reverse change of *l* to *d*: in *cadamitas* and *calamitas* it is not clear which is the older form. Corssen explains the change by saying that the tip of the tongue is in motion in sounding *l*, and also in sounding the dental *d*¹; but this first statement is scarcely true. A very weak *l* may be produced by pressing the tip of the tongue even against the teeth, instead of the front palate, as is usual: this is a thick sound and borders closely on *th*. Now if the Italian *d* were the true dental, the sound into which it passed was probably this *l*; which must then have differed from the common *l* sound. But it is more likely that the *d* was produced as with us; and therefore the *l* was also the common sound: for each the point of the tongue was pressed against the same point of the palate, and the transition was therefore easy. Nearly the same reason would explain the other change of *d* into *r*: which is not at all uncommon in old Latin, e.g. in Cato's book on agriculture; and *arfuerunt*, *arfuisse*, *aruorsum*, for *adfuerunt*, &c. occur in the Decree concerning the

Change
D to r.

¹ *Ausspr.* I. 223.

CH. VIII.

Bacchanalia¹. But in the classical Latin these words again appear with the *d*, shewing that the change was only beginning to be felt at the commencement of the literary epoch, which checked it: only three words which are familiar to us shew the *r*: these are *arbiter* (but *adbiterē*), *arcesso*, and *meridies* (root *madh*, as in Sanskrit *madhya* and μέσσος, i.e. μεθ-yo-s: this *dh* would become *d* in Latin²). The *r* must have been in these cases identical with the English *r*, in which there is no perceptible trill: it has been already more than once pointed out that the general position of the mouth for *d*, *l*, and this *r* is the same: but they differ in the degree and nature of the closure. This *r* accordingly differed from the sound into which *s* so often passed, which will be described afterwards: this no doubt was a strong trill. An intermediate sound is perhaps to be found in Umbrian, where *d* was changed into a sound still more resembling *s*, which, expressed in Roman characters, appears as *rs*³. I consider these two changes then as entirely due to a weak pronunciation of *d*: there is no need to suppose an assimilation by other sounds.

3. Substitution for Spirants.

I. Greek
substitutes
for the
spirants.

This, as has been often said, is the change which has affected the Greek language more than any other. No other letters have had so many substitutes or been so regularly allowed to drop: and there can be no doubt that the peculiar liquidity of the Greek—its constant accumulation of vowels without a consonant⁴—is mainly due to the loss of these rather insignificant sounds. I shall consider their substitutes and their loss together, since the

¹ Mommsen, *Corpus*, p. 43.

² See Quint. i. 6. 30.

³ Aufrecht and Kirchhoff, *Umb. Sprachdenmäler*, i. 84; and Corssen, i. 238—241.

⁴ A tolerably striking example is δηῶπεν, *Od.* iv. 226, which was once δᾱσ-yo-o-ye-vr. Four spirants have been resolved or vanished.

first pass naturally into the second, and cannot without inconvenience be taken separately.

(1) No trace is left of the symbol y in the earliest known period of Greek history. Instead we find ι especially in the suffix yo , which forms so many both primary and secondary nouns in all the languages¹. Thus, when added immediately to the root it produces numerous adjectives, $\pi\acute{\alpha}γιος$ ($\pi\alpha\gamma\text{-}yo\text{-}$), and nouns, such as $\nu\acute{\iota}ος$ ($\sigma\upsilon\text{-}yo\text{-}$)² sometimes with the ι displaced, as $\muοῖρα$ (i. e. $\muορ\text{-}ya$): added to bases it produces secondary nouns, such as $\alpha\acute{\nu}\delta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\iota\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$ ³, where however the double sound commonly passed into a monophthong, and $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\betaεια$ from $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\sigma\text{-}ya$: the feminine perfect participles, as $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ for $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phiοτ\text{-}ya$: and adjectives with the vowel again displaced, as $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambdaαινα$ for $\mu\epsilon\lambdaαν\text{-}ya$, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rhoεινα$ for $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rhoεν\text{-}ya$. The Greek $\epsilon\upsilon\text{-}\iota\omicron\text{-}\iota$ is clearly the equivalent of the Sanskrit

CH. VIII.

(1) *Changes of Y in Greek.*(i) $Y = \iota$.

¹ See Schleicher, *Comp.* p. 388, &c. Westphal (*Gr. Gr.* p. 75) most unaccountably holds $\iota\omicron$ to be the older form, without however denying the existence of y in Greece at some period, but restricting it to a small number of cases. One argument (out of many) seems conclusive against this hypothesis: why should $\iota\omicron$, if original, have undergone all the changes which Westphal supposes (into $yo\text{-}\epsilon\omicron$, &c.)? It was a compound which the Greeks liked. But y was a sound which they certainly disliked, and therefore tried to avoid in many different ways.

² Mr Paley (note to *Iliad* vii. 47) has "little doubt that the root of the word was $\phi\epsilon\mathbf{F}$." But I do not know a single certain instance where initial ϕ followed by no consonant has been dropped in Greek; for $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ and $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$, $\phi\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ and $\xi\omega\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\acute{\rho}\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ have not the slightest necessary connection: $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ and $\phi\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ have been already referred to $\sqrt{\phi a}$ and $\sqrt{\phi a\mathbf{F}}$: $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ surely must be connected with $a\text{-}\iota\omicron$ and Sanskrit $\hat{a}ha$, so that the root would be $\alpha\mathbf{GH}$ (*Gr. Et.* no. 611): $\xi\omega\varsigma$ has been already discussed: $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is from \mathbf{BHAR} : but $\delta\acute{\rho}\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ can be perfectly explained by the root \mathbf{AR} , see page 34. I know no other case where there is even a semblance of ϕ having been dropped. On the other hand, the loss of initial s is one of the commonest facts of the language. It therefore hold the derivation from \mathbf{SV} possible as far as form goes, and probable from the cognate words in other languages, but not sufficiently supported by cognate words in Greek itself to be regarded as certain: the derivation from $\phi\epsilon\mathbf{F}$ I hold to be impossible. Mr Paley (in the review already quoted, see page 153) calls each a "speculative etymology," implying that there is no reason why one should be more right than the other.

The ϵ in Mr Paley's $\phi\epsilon\mathbf{F}$ seems to be supported only by the \bar{e} in *fenus*, *femina*, &c. But there is no appearance of any \bar{e} in Italian; and if the root of these words was \mathbf{BHV} (as seems, on the whole, most probable; compare Oscan *fufans*, Umbrian *futu*, &c.), the e was due to vowel-intensification (*eu*), and its length is compensatory for the loss of the u .

³ Theok. xxviii. 10.

CH. VIII.

an-ya : but the common root is uncertain. The Sicilian Doric has *io* where the other dialects have *eo*, as *ἀργύριος*, *φουνίκιος*, &c. Another suffix of the same form occurs in many verbs; this takes the same form in Greek, namely, *io* for *yo*, e.g. *ἰδίω*, and *καίω* for *κα(F)-yo*, *δαίω* for *δα-yo*; and many times the vowel is thrown back, as *αἰρω* = *ἀρ-yo*, *τείνω* = *τεν-yo*¹. In the comparative suffix (*yant*) the *y* has generally been lost by assimilation, as in *βράσσω* for *βραχ-yων*, but appears as *ι* in *ἡδίων* and *ἀμείνων* for *ἀμεν-yων*. In the suffix *aya* which, as I have already said, has given us the verbs in *-αώ*, *-εω*, and *-ωω*, the spirant is lost altogether. It appears as *ι* in the old Ionic genitive-suffix, as *ἵπποιο* for *ἵππο-σyo*. Next, original *y* = *ε*, though much less frequently. This appears in *κενεός*, the Epic and Doric form of *κεν-yo*, "empty," and similar forms *στερεός*, *ἀδελφεός*, *έτεός*, &c. In the verbs *κυρέω*, *κτυπέω*, &c. which stand by *κύρω* and *ἐκτυπον*, the *ε* probably stands for *y*, though the affix may have been *ε(y)o* originally *aya*, and the *y* altogether lost. The suffix of the future, *syo*, was in Doric resolved into both *σιω* and *σεω*: the first is found in the severer Doric of Crete and Heraclea, e.g. *πραξίομεν*²; the second is implied in the contracted forms *πραξῶ* and *πραξοῦντι*³. Apparently *ε* stands for *y* in *εὔτε*, i.e. *yo-te*, which more commonly lost the *y* altogether. At the beginning of a word *y* has remained as *h* in a few cases. These are the pronoun *ὅς* with its ablative *ὥς*⁴; the Homeric *ὑσμίνη*, where the root is certainly the same as the Sanskrit *√yudh* (the *θ* passing into *σ* before *μ*), *ἦπαρ*, Latin *iecur*, Sanskrit *yakrit*, and *ὑμεῖς*, where our "you" recalls the Sanskrit *yu-shmē*; and a few more⁵. Sometimes not even the rough breathing remains, as in the Aeolic *ῥμμες* and *ῥττι* in Sappho⁶. Lastly, the spirant was absolutely lost within a word, in Attic especially,

(ii) *Y* = *ε*.(iii) *Y* = the rough breathing.(iv) *Y* is lost.

¹ These have been already fully discussed at page 54 : see also Curtius, *Temp. und Modi*, 94.

² Ahrens, II. 210.

³ Id. 217.

⁴ See p. 150.

⁵ *Gr. Et.* 368, and Schleicher, *Comp.* 217.

⁶ *Frag.* I. 15.

as in *κενός*, &c.; in the simple future *-σω*, where there is no contraction as in the Doric to mark the loss: in genitives like *ἵππου* and (Doric and Aeolic) *ἵππω* for *ἵππο-ο*: in the contracted verbs universally: and in some Doric and Aeolic words where the Attic has *ι*, as *ποέω*¹, *χαλκίος*², and Aeolic forms as *Ἄλκαος*³, *ἀλάθεια*⁴. Other different forms as *ζ* or even *δ*, under which original *γ* appears, are not substitutes, but the result of assimilation or indistinctness of pronunciation, and will be described in the final chapter.

Curtius suggests that this *γ* must have had something of the guttural about it, as indeed we might have inferred from its being sounded quite at the back of the palate, and therefore nearer to the gutturals than to any other sound which the Greek possesses. He argues from the Epic and Doric futures, where the *ξ* seems to be produced by the assimilating force of the *σ*, *κλαγ(α)σγω*, *κλαγσῶ*, *κλακ-σῶ*, *κλαξῶ*⁵: so also *ἐφθαξα* apparently comes from *ἐφθα-γα-σα*⁶.

(2) Original *s* retains its place in Greek generally at the end of roots and words. Thus it generally occurs in *√ές*, *√Fες*, *√ής*, &c., except when the suffix which follows begins with a vowel or *μ*: as in *ἐστί*, *ἐσθής*, *ῆσται*, &c.; but *ἐ(σ)ύς*, *ἐ(σ)-ανό-ς*, *ἡμένος*, &c.: and indeed the cases, where a vowel follows as well as precedes the *σ*, are more common than the others where it does not. But at the end of a suffix it is regularly kept—in formative suffixes, as *-ες* and *-ος* (*σαφές*, *ἔδος*, &c.), and in case-suffixes, as *-ς* of the nominative, *-ος* of the genitive: indeed *ς* is one of the few letters which the Greek could endure at the end of a word. At the beginning of a word it is sometimes found, as in *σάος* (*σῶς*); in *συνή*, *σελήνη*, &c., which are probably from *SVIK* (whence German *schweigen*) and *SVAR* (the

(2) Changes of *S*.

(i) *S* = *σ*.

¹ As read in Theok. *e.g.* viii. 18, &c. by Ahrens, from the best MS.

² *Id.* ii. 36.

³ *Ale. Frag.* 24 (9), in Ahrens, i. 245.

⁴ Theok. xxix. 1.

⁵ Theok. vi. 32, where however Ahrens deserts his MS. (K) and reads *κλασῶ*: but *ἀπόκλαζον* (*ib.* xv. 43).

⁶ Theok. ii. 115.

CH. VIII.

(ii) S=
rough
breathing.

Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{sva}}$ r, and Latin *Sol*, compare *somnus* from $\sqrt{\text{svap}}$, &c.); and the σ seems to have been generally kept when another spirant had fallen out immediately after it; but it is only regularly retained when a hard consonant follows immediately, as *σκάζω*, *στορ-έννυμι*, *στα-τός*, &c.: because the cognate hard protects it from the customary passage into the rough breathing, though even here the σ is sometimes lost, as in *ταῦρος* and some others which will be given under the head of Loss in consonantal groups. Generally speaking too, σ standing at the beginning of a word was retained when its loss would have obscured the radical form too much: this will explain *σαός* mentioned above, which would have become identical with *ἄς* or *ὤς*. Next, the rough breathing is found regularly, as in *ἔδ-ος*, *ἔπω*, *ὑπνος*, *ὅς* (the pronoun of the third person, originally *sua*, not the relative *ya* which takes the same form in Greek); in all these the analogies of other languages shew that σ once began the word. The rough breathing of the Greek is sometimes due to a lost σ , which was not initial in the word: as *εἰστήκει* for *ἐ-σεστε-κει*, through *ἐἔστηκε*; perhaps also¹ *ἡμένος* mentioned above for *ἡσμένος*, *ἡ μένος*: when the rough breathing had become regular in the forms where σ was dropped, it would pass over even to the few where it was retained, as *ἡσται*, though etymologically it was wrong there: certainly the same root *ās*, to sit, in Sanskrit has no initial sibilant². With respect to *s* the Greek and Sanskrit usages are directly opposed. The Sanskrit retains it at the beginning of a word, but suffers it at the end of a word, under certain conditions, to pass into the Visarga or slightly heard final breath. Indeed in Sanskrit as in Latin the true *h* is the relic of an aspirate: in Greek it never appears but as the representative of a lost spirant. It must have been on the

¹ Schleich. *Comp.* 219.

² *Gr. Et.* 568. Prof. Curtius however rejects this explanation of a misplacement of sound (p. 641), preferring to suppose a mere late mistake. No doubt such did occur, but when other causes can be given, these have surely the first claim to be regarded.

wane even when denoted by the symbol H, as is proved by its being sometimes omitted in old inscriptions¹: and I agree with Professor Curtius that, although the fact of its omission in the alphabet established at Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian war cannot be taken to prove its absolute loss—we know it must have remained by its aspirating effect on consonants—yet it proves at least that it was verging to extinction: moreover the sound was probably growing rare when it was so often placed wrongly, as ἱππος, ὕδωρ, ἰπός, &c.², words which can be shewn from other languages to have originally begun with a smooth breathing: the same mistake occurred in Latin and for the same reason, e.g. when *umor*, *umerus*, &c. had *h* prefixed to them: the gradual loss of the *h* from some forms produced an uncertainty in its use, which caused its introduction into other forms where it had no business. The Athenians, as I have mentioned before, offended most in this respect: in Aeolic the loss of the *h* was so regular, that the tendency to introduce it wrongly never gained ground.

The loss of the rough breathing in Greek leads to much confusion. Thus it is difficult to distinguish in compounds the negative *a* from the *â* which came through *â* from *sa*, “with,” except by the sense, e.g. in ἀδελφός, where we are guided to the derivation σα-δελφο-, born of the same womb, by the Sanskrit *sa-garbha*, which is perhaps the same word, though the change of *g* to *δ* is very difficult.

Frequently there is no trace of the *σ* left at all. Its loss at the beginning of a word before a liquid or nasal, as in √(σ)ρῦ, (σ)νυός, &c. will come under the general head of Loss in consonantal groups. But the loss which has produced most effect on the language is its falling out between two vowels³, in verbs as τύπτῃ from τύπτε(σ)αι,

(iii) *S* is lost.

¹ Gr. Et. 634.

² Ibid. 640.

³ The loss is rather more extensive in the Laconian than in other dialects: e.g. μῶα occurs for μῶσα (μοῦσα),

CH. VIII.

in nouns as γένους from γένε(σ)ος. To this very important rule there are hardly any exceptions; and these again are principally where the loss of the σ would have caused great confusion. Thus if the σ had been allowed to fall out, e.g. in τάσις (from τα-τι-ς), the result would have been the same as the dative of the article. Therefore in these derivative nouns, and in inflections like τίθησι and τίθεσαι, and in some few other cases, the Greeks used sufficient effort to retain the spirant. The contractions resulting from its regular and constant loss have been described systematically under the diphthongs.

The change of *s* into *ρ* is pretty well confined to the Laconian: the nature of it will be described under the changes of Latin *s*. Thus we find πόρ instead of πούς, τίρ for τίς, θιόρ for θεός, &c., among the glosses of Hesychius: παλεόρ is παλαιός in Aristophanes¹.

(3) Changes
of *v*.
(i) *V* = **F**.

(3) The remaining spirant *v* was known to the Greeks later than *γ* by a distinct symbol, the Digamma, as it was called from its form. This **F**, as is well known, is found on old Aeolic and Doric inscriptions, and unmistakeable traces of its presence (as well as of the other semivowel) are to be found in Homer; not indeed with perfect regularity; sometimes e.g. we find ἰδεῖν and sometimes **F**ιδεῖν²; this would be not unnatural at a time when the sound was dying out: but it accords best with the theory that the poems were arranged late. There seems to be no reason to suppose (what is possible on phonetic grounds) that either of the other spirants *γ* or *σ* passed into **F** before they disappeared. **F** is the representative of original *v*, and of that only, in spite of one or two mistakes in inscriptions, natural at a time when the *v*-sound had become almost as strange as *γ*, but the symbol **F** was still

¹ *Lys.* 988: see for more examples Ahrens, II. 71, &c.: Westphal, *Gr. Gr.* p. 34.

² Thus in *Iliad* I. 203 we read
ἧ ἴνα ὕβριν ἰδῆς Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἄρπεδαο;
but in line 262

οὐ γάρ πω τοιοῦς ἰδὼν ἀνέρας, οὐδὲ **F**ἰδωμαι.

remembered¹. That the sound was the same as that of the English *w*, not *v*, is most probable from the easy transition of the semivowel to the vowel, and *vice versa*: see also the arguments respecting the sound of the Latin *v*.

Examples of the symbol **F** in Aeolic and Doric are to be found in Ahrens². Thus we have **Foi** in Sappho³ and **Feίπην** (i. e. *εἰπεῖν*⁴); though here, as well as in Homer, it was often omitted; e. g. *φάεινδον εἶδος*⁵, though *√vid* probably retained the *v*-sound at least as long as any other word. In spite indeed of the term "Aeolic digamma," used by grammarians, the evidence of the surviving fragments would seem to shew that the Aeolic commonly changed *v* to *u*, or hardened it (by dissimilation generally) to **β**; it was retained, however, more regularly by the Boeotian variety of the Aeolic, which resembled the Doric more than any other⁶. In Doric we have the evidence of numerous glosses of Hesychius⁷, where indeed the symbol used is **Γ**, but where it is almost certain that the **F** must be replaced, the mistake being that of the copyist: it is indeed possible that a *g* should be produced before a *w*-sound, as it has been produced in French *guêpe*, *gâter*: the tongue (as has been already pointed out) is in the same position for sounding *w* as for sounding *g*: but the action of the lips is added for the *w*. But Ahrens has pointed out that the glosses in which this **γ** occurs, although generally Laconian, yet sometimes bear the mark of being Lesbian and sometimes Boeotian: and it is certainly not conceivable that **γ** should be found in all these dialects instead of *v*, without more explicit evidence for the fact. Also **F** occurs in tolerable frequency in inscriptions of the old Doric; e. g. in words like *κλέφος*, *αιFεί* (compare *aeuom*), &c. But even from these it is clear that the letter was rapidly passing out of common use.

¹ See *Gr. Et.* 368.

² *Dial. Graec.* i. 30, &c.; ii. 42, &c.

³ ii. 1.

⁴ *Id.* xxvi. 2.

⁵ *Id.* iii. 2.

⁶ See numerous examples from inscriptions in Ahrens, i. 169, &c.

⁷ *Id.* ii. 53, &c.

CH. VIII.

(ii) $V = v$.

It is resolved into v in $\delta\upsilon\omicron$ certainly in common Greek ; and in Lesbian we have forms like $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ for $\chi\epsilon\text{F}\omega$, $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ for $\pi\nu\text{F}\omega$, $\alpha\upsilon\eta\rho$, $\alpha\upsilon\omega\varsigma$, &c., where the letter is entirely lost in Attic Greek. In all these the v is the radical vowel, intensified in the present-stem ; but it must have taken the w -sound (that is, F) before the vowel ω : which was then written as v by the Aeolic when they lost the symbol F . The v is also found in the Ionic $\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, the genitive of $\gamma\acute{\omicron}\nu\nu$, instead of $\gamma\omicron\nu\text{F}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ ¹ : in $\mu\omicron\upsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\mu\omicron\nu\text{-F}\omicron\varsigma$, &c.

(iii) $V =$
rough
breathing.

It appears as the rough breathing at the beginning of a word ; so that all the spirants in Greek can be resolved into h . This is at once seen by comparison with the Latin : $\epsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\varsigma = \text{uesper}$; $\epsilon\eta\nu\nu\mu\iota$ has the same root as vestis . The rough breathing thus produced is liable to the same affections as that which represents σ : thus we have $\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma$: $\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\rho$ (whence $\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}$) came to have the smooth breathing in time, as the verb ($\iota\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$) seems very early to have had.

Sporadic
substitutes
of v .
(iv) $V = \beta$.

These are the regular substitutes for v , found to some extent in all dialects. Many more examples might easily have been given of these substitutions : but a few suffice, because they are familiar. But there are others very difficult to explain, which occur sporadically, or in one dialect only. Thus in the Laconian v appears commonly hardened to β ; e.g. as in $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$ (where the original v is shewn by our "work"), in $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ for $\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Latin *vetus*, originally a "year," whence the adjective *ueter-nus*, as *diurnus* from *dies*), in $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\iota$, $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, and many other cases where the sound is initial : in $\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\beta\acute{\omega}\rho$ (Lesbian $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\omega\varsigma$), in the Cretan $\acute{\alpha}\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$, the Argive $\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\alpha$ (compare Latin *oua*), and other words where the sound was medial. And one example common to all Greek is given by the common verb $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, which is the Ionic form of $\beta\omicron\lambda\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, Aeolic $\beta\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and severe Doric $\beta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. That the original consonant was v seems clear from Sanskrit *vr̥i* (VAR), Latin *uolo*, Gothic *vil-jan*, and Slav. *vol-it-i*² : it is

¹ Comp. 222.² Gr. Et. No. 659.

scarcely to be supposed that all the other languages agreed to weaken a sound preserved only by the Greek. This β then, like the dialectic varieties given above, must be regarded as a strengthening, though there is no apparent reason for it. V sometimes passed into β before ρ or λ in the Aeolic, as we shall see hereafter; but here the reason is obvious, the influence of the following sound; but no such cause can be assigned for these initial changes. Was the hard Doric β an exceptionally weak sound, itself hardly stronger than v ? This is possible, and the change is intelligible, if the Greek v -sound were a true labial, not a labio-dental; that is, either our w , or the labial v : then a weak b would naturally pass into this sound. Curtius thinks¹ that o and u may have had a dissimilating effect on the F , just as we saw in Latin that vu was regularly avoided; and Curtius thinks that *ferb-ui* from *ferv-* and *bub-ile* from *bov-* are due to this principle². So perhaps the β in *βούλωμαι* may be due to the combined influence of o and λ : but this principle will not explain the Laccian words where o does not occur more than any other vowel.

Another variation of v —into μ —has been often assumed³; the change is probable for a very small list of words, scarcely more than those in which μ passes in obscure dialects into β . Curtius allows the change for *μάλευρον*⁴ from $\sqrt{F}\alpha\lambda$, whence *ἀλέω*, to grind corn. Max Müller⁵ thinks that here and in some other words initial μ has been dropped, and refers *ἄλευρον* to *MAR*, whence Latin *mola*, &c. Curtius denies the loss of initial μ , as also the transition from μ , a common and easy sound, to v , a sound for which the Greeks had no liking, and which was becoming very uncommon. This argument, I think, is strong; and it will account for the change of F to μ , although to us the latter may seem the harder sound.

¹ *Gr. Et.* 533.

² See however Corssen, *Krit. Beitr.* 165, and Schleicher, 255.

³ See Curtius, pp. 539—545.

⁴ *Theok.* xv. 116.

⁵ *II.* 323.

(v) $V = \mu$.

The two are pronounced so closely together (that is, if we assume that the Greek *v* was a true labial), that in chance cases the Greeks, wishing to avoid *v*, might easily slip into *μ*. Other words, in which Curtius allows the change, are *μαλλός* (Latin *willus*, and *μῆλον* can hardly be separated from this group), *μέλδομαι* by *ἔλδομαι*, *μάρπτω* by Sanskrit *√vark*, *μολπίς* by *ἐλπís* (a dialectical variety in Hesychius), and *ἀμφήν* by *αὐχήν*¹. It is commonly assumed in *μόσχος* by *ῥσχος* and *μηρύω*² by *ἐρύω*. It will be seen that in all these cases there is much uncertainty. I may mention here the pretty certain change of *aF(ι)-vos*—from *ανί*, Greek *ὄφι*—into *ὀμνός*, though this is not substitution, but arises from the influence of the *ν*. In the simple cases of substitution, the *μ* must be regarded as one of the many attempts made by the Greeks to avoid the *w*-sound, which was so unpleasant to them. The same struggle led to a different result in many words, i. e. to the introduction of a weak vowel-sound before the *w*, which then fell out, leaving the vowel behind it: such cases are *ἐ-(F)ἔλδ-ομαι* beside *μέλδομαι*, and many others where the *μ*-form does not occur, as *ἐ-(F)έργω*, *ἐ-(F)είκοσι*, *ἐ-(F)ίσση* (= *αἶσα*), perhaps *ἐορτή* compared with Sanskrit *vrata*, &c.

The change of *F* into *γ* is more strange. It occurs in no common word, but is supported by some rare dialectical forms, which need not here detain us³. It must be regarded as an irregular anticipation of the change (regular in modern Greek) by which *γ* is sounded as a strong *y*⁴: but the very small number of words, for which the change from *F* to *γ* can be assumed, is totally inadequate to prove that *γ* had universally sunk into the weak sound of modern times. The Boeotian *ἰών* for *ἐγών* undoubtedly points to a weak sound of the *γ* in that dialect: we have before

¹ For this word Schmidt (*Vokalismus*, I. 181) lays down an original form *ἀγχήν*, passing by labialisation into *ἀμφήν*, and into *αὐχήν* by vocalisation of the nasal; just as he would form *βύθος* from *βένθος*.

² Theok. I. 29.

³ See *Gr. Et.* 546.

⁴ See Geldart, p. 30.

seen that the Boeotian resembles the modern Greek¹. Forms like *γαῖα* and (F)*αῖα* are of course not in point: the *γ* here is radical and the parasitic *v* has forced it out.

I have thus shewn the different simple sounds to which the spirants sank in Greek, and how they sometimes passed out, leaving no mark at all. Further changes worked by them will be found under the head of Assimilation, and still more when we come to treat of indistinct articulation.

The spirants in Latin have been also very considerably affected; but not in any way which so profoundly influenced the character of the language as the changes above mentioned modified the Greek. The Latin had indeed no special symbols for *y* and *v*; but the sounds were denoted pretty regularly by *i* and *u*; they had not nearly so many substitutes as we have seen in the Greek.

(1) First, *y* had its full sound preserved by *i* at the beginning of words, as *iug-um*, *ius*, &c., or syllables, as *iniustus*; and between two vowels, as *plebeius*, *aio*, *eius*, &c.² According to Priscian this *y*-sound between two vowels in two syllables was originally denoted by *ii*, e.g. *eius*: so that even three *i*'s might meet together, as in *Pompeiii*³: according to Quintilian this usage survived down to Cicero's times. It must be remembered that when *a*, *e*, *o* or *u* precede the *i* thus produced from *y*, the combination is not a diphthong, but a vowel followed by a consonant. After consonants the *i* might be either the vowel, or it might still have the semivowel sound; e.g. *princip-ium*⁴, *conubium*⁵, &c. It is frequently lost altogether, e.g. in the verbs of the first and second conjugation, where the *a-o* and *e-o* represent the Indo-European and Sanskrit *aya*; the original *a* being split up, as in Greek: it is dropped in *ob(y)icio* and *ob(y)ex*, and other compounds of *iacio*: in

II. Substitutes for the spirants in Latin.

(1) Changes of *Y*.

(i) *Y*=*i*.

(ii) *Y* is lost.

¹ See page 276.

² *Comp.* 252.

³ See Corssen, i. 299.

⁴ *Hor. Od.* iii. 6. 6.

⁵ *Lucr.* iii. 776, and Munro's notes: I think the evidence is in favour of the long *u* in the Augustan age.

CH. VIII.

cunctus for *co-iunctus*; rarely in comparatives, as *min(i)or* and probably *plus* for *plo-ius*; in *ero*, which stands for *es-yo*.¹ From these examples it is clear that the semivowel sound was in the main preserved by the Italians, only with no symbol to distinguish it from the cognate vowel.

{2) Changes
of *s*.
(i) *S=s*.

(2) *S*, unlike the Greek *σ*, is retained regularly before a vowel, and sometimes before consonants at the beginning of a word; it is frequently lost at the end, at least in the common pronunciation, and in the older poetry; but replaced through the influence of the Greek rules, in the nominatives of nouns of the *o*-declension, as *bono-s*, not in those of the *a*-declension, as *advena(s)*, except sometimes *paricidas* and the rare *hosticapas*; nor in the genitives of the *a*-, *e*-, or *o*-stems. Examples are given in plenty by Corssen² from inscriptions of the age of the Second Punic war, of nominatives where the *s* was not written: but it reappears regularly at the end of the second century B.C.: by the beginning of the fourth century A.D. final *s* was again entirely lost³. *s* is held by Corssen to have been sounded strongly when initial, and generally before or after consonants: but weakly between two vowels, and after *n*, which was itself weakly pronounced before *s*, and often entirely vanished⁴; so that *s* was really in the same position as if a vowel had immediately preceded it. These two sounds can have been only the common *s* and *z*, the hard and soft sibilants. But it has been already mentioned that the symbol *z* fell out of the alphabet at a very early period: and it is the most natural inference that the sound was lost also: it was probably this *z*-sound which passed into *r*, as will be pointed out immediately. Mr Roby seems to me quite right in denying that *s*, when it remained unchanged between two vowels, had the sound of *z*⁵: if so, it should

¹ *Comp.* 252. Corssen (*Krit. Beitr.* 498) would derive *-dum* and *-dem* from *dyam*, i. e. *divam*.

² *I.* 286.

³ *Id.* i. 294.

⁴ E. g. *cosol* for *consul*, on the tomb of Scipio Barbatus, *formo(n)sus*, &c.

⁵ *Grammar*, p. liv.

have passed into *r*, like others similarly situated. This view is supported by the fact that there is very often a wavering between *s* and *ss*, e.g. *causa* and *caussa*, *usus* and *ussus*: and similar waverings have been already cited as evidence of the strength of the sound: here *ss* would seem to be in general etymologically correct, the first *s* being the result of assibilation of the final letter of the root; then the recognised strength of *s* in these words led to the dropping of one. There is good evidence for the use of *ss* down to a late period in the best MSS. of Virgil and Quintilian's express statement¹ as to the usage of Cicero. As both *caussa* and *causa* occur side by side in the same inscription², it cannot be imagined that the first was sounded *causa* and the second *cauza*. Next we have the cases where *s* became *r*, which are very numerous, and characteristic of the language. Thus we find *Lares* instead of the *Lases* of the Carmen Arvale, *ara* instead of *asa*, which is found in every other Italian dialect³; *quaero* is the younger form of *quaeso*; *gero*, *haurio*, *uro* shew the original *s* in their supines: *eram* and *ero* are from *√es*: the genitives *arboris*, *muris*, &c., are from bases *arbos*, *mus*, &c., which in later times sometimes allowed even the *s* which marked the nominative case to sink to *r*, as *arbor*: in the genitives plural *r* is the substitute for the old *s*, which in Greek fell out altogether; compare *dearum* for *deāsām* with *θεά(σ)ων θεῶν*⁴: *plurimus* is the *plus-imus* of the Carmen Saliare. This change of *s* to *r* is also found before *n* and *m*; thus *verna* is *vesna*,⁵ *veternus* is *vetus-nus*, the *e* being due to the following *r*: and *carmen* is most probably *cas-men*⁶, in spite of the Greek *ποίημα*, which would lead us to derive *carmen* from *KAR* "to make," which is undoubtedly found in *cre-are*: but we have *Casmenae*, the Latin Muses, which would be inexpli-

(ii) *S = r*.¹ I. 7. 20.³ *Ib.* I. 229.⁴ I do not mean that *θεός* is the same word as *deus*, see p. 37.⁵ See p. 152.² Corssen, I. 282.⁶ *Krit. Beitr.* 406.

CH. VIII.

cable except from KAS, whence the Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{çam}}$ s, "to say" or "praise." Lastly, *s* sinks to *r* at the end of a word after a vowel, as in *amor*¹, and *arbor* just mentioned. According to Cicero, Papirius Crassus (consul 336) was the last of his race who was called by the old name Papisius: without pressing this statement too far, we may fairly conclude that the change was growing general about that time. It was not a very great one: the *r* must have been the strong trill: for which the mouth is just in the position for sounding *s* or *z*; but the tongue is held more loosely. The tolerably synchronous establishment of the *r* and dying-out of the *z* is strongly in favour of Mr Roby's view, that where the *s* remained it was the hard sibilant.

Old Ita-
lian *z*.

We find the actual symbol *z* both in Oscan and in Umbrian. From *menzaru* (i.e. *mensarum*) and *horz* (i.e. *hortus*) we see that the other Italian dialects possessed a distinct symbol to denote the soft sibilant, which had died out in Latin soon after the time of the XII. Tables. *z* does not reappear at Rome till the common introduction of Greek words: when it was again used, but to represent ζ, a very different sound. When it appears in Plautine manuscripts it is through a confusion with the later *z*: for the Romans of Plautus' time undoubtedly represented *z* by *s* or *ss*, according as it was initial or medial: *sona*² (ζώνη) or *badisso*³.

(iii) *S* is
lost.

Sometimes, though only irregularly, *s* vanishes altogether between two vowels, just as it did in the Greek. Thus we have *uim* which must be for *uisim* from *uis*, for *uires* stands for *uis-es*. *Vēr* for *ueser* (Fέ(σ)αρ) has been

¹ Analogous to this change in the South European family is that of *s* (final) into *r* in the Norse among the languages of North Europe. Thus the inflectional *s* of the nom. appears as *r* in masc. strong nouns and some feminines, e.g. *heim-r*, *feld-r*, *bruð-r* (fem.). *Mer* and *per* are datives of the 1st and 2nd pronoun corresponding to Gothic *mis* and thus: *hwer* (who) is the Gothic *hwas*. The verb *as* makes in the present: 1. *em*, 2. *ert*, 3. *er* (*es*), 1. *erum*, 2. *erut*, 3. *em*. The plural nom. of nouns also shews *r*, as *heim-ar*, *feld-ir*, *bruð-ar*.

² So *Trin.* 862, ed. Brix; sector sonarius, i.e. a cut-purse.

³ See Corssen, i. 295.

already mentioned. Similarly the *s* is lost in genitives like *die(s)i*, whence eventually *die*, *plebe(s)i*, &c.¹

(3) Finally, *v* in Latin has much the same history as *y*. It is represented by *u*, e.g. in *uideo*, *nouos*, *ouis*. Sometimes this *u* is simply the vowel, as in *ecus* (*equos*), *relicuos*², &c. Not unfrequently it fell out, like *y*: e.g. in *s(u)ibi* and *t(u)ibi*, the roots being *sva* and *tva*; in *de(v)os*, *so(v)os*, &c.; in verbs like *fluont* from $\sqrt{\text{flu}}$, and especially in the perfects, &c., formed with suffix *-vi*, e.g. *no(ue)runt*, *no(ue)ram*, &c. Further examples, if required, will be found in the *Compendium*³.

The supposed change of *v* into *m* in *māre*, compared with Sanskrit *vāri*, "water," is rejected by Corssen⁴ rightly, I think. He shews that the root *var* is preserved in Italian river-names as *Varusa*, *Varranus*, &c., so that *mare* more probably belongs to $\sqrt{\text{mar}}$ in the sense of "the waste." The first derivation may seem better as regards sense, but must be rejected as sinning against the laws of sound: the second need not be accepted, or only provisionally till another is discovered which satisfies the sense better, and is equally possible phonetically⁵.

The sound of *v* in Latin has been much discussed of late⁶. The arguments of Mr Roby and Prof. Munro appear to me to prove conclusively that it was not the English labio-dental *v*: but it is not quite certain, to my mind, whether it was *w* or the labial *v*, though the former is more probable. I have only room to give the merest summary of these arguments: but they are easily accessible. The most important are derived, first, from the absence of any distinct symbol for *v*: and as *u* was sounded

CH. VIII.

(3) Change of *V*.(i) *V* = *u*.(ii) *V* is lost.*V* not = *m*.Probable sound of *v* in Latin.¹ *Krit. Beitr.* 465.² E.g. in *Lucr.* i. 560. Perhaps the length of the first syllable may mark an assimilated *d*, *red-licuos*: cf. *sella* for *sed-la*.³ pp. 253, 254.⁴ *Krit. Beitr.* 237.⁵ *M* and *v* interchange frequently in Welsh: as in *moel* and *foel*, a hill, *mawr* and *fawr*, great, &c.: the symbol indeed here is *f*, but the sound is *v*, and is, so far as I can detect, labial.⁶ See the *Academy*, Nos. 20—23; and the admirable discussion in Roby's *Grammar*, pp. xxxii.—xlii.

CH. VIII.

(oo), it is probable that the consonant was the nearest possible to (oo), that is *w*: that there was some slight difference between *u* and *v* is shewn by Claudius' introduction of a new symbol. Secondly, the interchange of the *u* and *v*-sounds is more explicable on the *w*-hypothesis; e.g. *genua* and *genva*, *solvo* and *soluo*: so is (thirdly) the loss of the *v* in *ama(ue)ram*, &c.; and (fourthly) the retention of *o* after *v* in words like *ceruos*, whereas it otherwise sunk to *u* (oo); now (vo) and (voo) are about equally easy sounds, but (wo) and (woo) are not; compare the frequent loss in English of *w* before (oo), as in *wool*, *woman*, &c. Fifthly, the name *vau* (whence our *vee*) given to it in post-classical times, according to Priscian, because of its resemblance to the digamma, is more intelligible if the sound was *w*: the name by analogy should have been *ev* (for, in momentary sounds, the vowel follows, in continuous sounds it precedes the consonant), and, doubtless, would have been so, if the sound had been *v*: but it would have been inaudible, or nearly so, if the consonant was *w*; and, therefore, the vowel was in this case post-fixed. The above arguments are all Mr Roby's: to him also is due a most thorough discussion of the transliteration of *v* into Greek: the fact, that β is often found there for it, is the strongest argument for the *v*-sound. Two questions here arise: what was the sound of β ? and how far was β used? In reply to the first, β is certainly *v* in modern Greek; but this *v* seems to be labial, not labio-dental: and I have already pointed out the affinity of the labial *v* and β . Consequently, if β had represented *v* regularly in Greek transliteration of Latin words, this would be an argument only for the labial sound of *v*, that is, for something nearer our *w* than our *v*. But the representation of *v* by β , as Mr Roby has clearly shewn, occurs but rarely in the older writers, and with increasing frequency the later we pass along the scale. Thus, in Polybius (second cent. B.C.) *ov* is regular: in Dionysius Halicarnassensis *ov* is much more common, but β is also found: but in Plutarch (first cent. after Christ) the number

of times in which β occurs is 180, while *ov* is still found 323 times. It is clear, therefore, that this transliteration of *v* by β cannot be separated from the tendency to confuse together the *v* and *b* in Italian itself, which shews itself in the second century after Christ, and afterwards increases: but which probably occurred, at least dialectically, much earlier, if we may judge from double forms, such as *Labici* and *Lauici*, *Fabius* and *Fovius*, &c.: it is by far the most probable that the *v*, in all such cases, was the labial *v*, which passed into *b* irregularly, but never permanently: thus, *uiuere* was *bibere* in inscriptions of the fifth century after Christ, but the *v* is found again in modern Italian. The occurrence of a labial *v* in Latin would also account for rare changes, like *ferueo* and *ferbui*, *boues* and *bubile*, &c. Therefore, so far as the argument from transliteration goes, we seem to have evidence for a *w*-sound, or a labial *v*: and, combining this argument with those already adduced, I think it most probable that *v* was generally *w*, but sometimes (dialectically) a labial *v*.

4. *Changes of the Aspirates in Latin.*

Lastly, I shall take under the head of Substitution the numerous changes of the aspirates in Latin. Some indeed of them seem to be due to *Loss*; others, if Corssen's explanation of them be true, should rather come under the head of Indistinct Articulation. But since neither of these causes can be certainly made out, and since, if divided, the history of the aspirates would be less intelligible, I have thought it better to put the whole of the changes together under the simplest head: at all events one sound has been substituted for another.

The most remarkable point in the history of the aspirates in Latin is that each of them can be represented by one symbol, the peculiar Italian *f*. That this *f* is no aspirate is obvious, if only from the fact that it has not the

The Latin aspirate f.

CH. VIII.

power of the Latin momentary sounds to assimilate a nasal which precedes it: we have *im-petus* for example, but only *inficio*¹: this shews that the *f* is quite different from the Greek ϕ , which has the assimilating power, as in $\epsilon\mu\phi\alpha\lambda\omega$ ². For the difference of sound between these two, we have Priscian's well-known dictum: that *ph* is produced "fixis labris," but *f* not. This need not necessarily mean that *ph* was a momentary sound (though it probably was) and *f* a protracted one: it may only mean that *ph* was a labial and *f* a labio-dental: which last statement is probable on other grounds.

F represents original BH and DH at the beginning of a word:

It regularly occurs as the representative of initial BH. This we should expect from its partially labial character. Thus we have *fari* from BHA, whence Greek $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$; *fui* from BHU; *fugio* from BHUG, &c. But it is hardly less frequently found as the representative of initial DH. That aspirate has left no Latin exponent of its own kind, at once dental and aspirate, or even a dental spirant: *f* has taken the place. Thus *fumus* is the Latin derivative of DHU, the same in form as $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}s$ and Sanskrit *dhūma*; *fores* represents *dvāra* (Sk.) and $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha$: *firmus* is from DHAR "to hold firmly;" a root which gives an extraordinary number of derivatives in Latin³, including *formido* "stiffening fear," *forma*, *forum*, and many names of "strongholds," as *Formiae*, *Ferentinum*, *Forentum* and *Ferentia*: many more examples are given by Corssen. Both the labial and dental aspirate are regularly represented at the beginning of a word by *f*.

sometimes even GH.

But there are even cases where initial *f* represents GH. Such are *fel*, which seems undoubtedly to be the same as $\chi\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$, our "gall," that is from original *ghal*; the verbs quoted by Priscian and Festus, *futire* and *futare*, with *futilis* are from \sqrt{fu} , the same as $\sqrt{\chi\upsilon}$ in $\chi\epsilon\text{F}\omega$; *formus* and

¹ Corssen however (i. 138) quotes some examples from the *Corpus*, as *com-fluunt*, *im fronte*. But these are certainly exceptional.

² See Curtius in the *Zeitschrift*, II. 333.

³ I. 148.

feruor stand by Sanskrit *gharma*, our "warm," while the Greek shews a change from the guttural to the dental in *θερμός*: *fames*, and *ad-fatim fatigo* are from the same root as *χά-τις*; *friare* and *friuolus* are akin to *χρί-ειν*. Commonly however there is another form beginning with *h*, existing side by side with that in *f*, and used by educated men¹; we have *faedus*, but classical *haedus*, our "goat," where the Teutonic has kept the *g* of the original GH: *fordeum* and *hordeum*, German *gerst*; *fariolus* and *hariolus*, Greek *χορ-δή*; *folus* and *holus*, Greek *χλοή*; *fostis* and *hostis*, German *gast*, our "guest;" &c. This *f* for *gh* is only initial.

If we continue our search, we shall find that this *f* does not occur much in the middle of Latin words. We have *scrofa*, the pig, conceived as the "grubber," by the side of *scrob-s*² and probably *scrib-ere*. But, as a rule, we shall find that BH has almost universally under these circumstances passed into *b*: e.g. *ambo*, *tibi*, *lubet*³, *nubes*⁴, &c., with hosts of others. But it is an instructive fact that by the side of the Latin *b* there is found *f* in the other Italian dialects. Thus *Safinus* is the Oscan for *Sabinus*; the proper names *Alfius* and *Alfenus* should be compared with the Latin *Albius* and *Albinus*: *Orfius* with Latin *orbus*, &c.⁵ The same *mutatis mutandis* applies to DH: this is *d* in Latin *medius* (*madh-ya*), in *aedes*⁶, in *dedo*, *condo*, &c., from DHA "to place," &c.: but the Oscan for "middle" is *mefia*; and the Oscan *Rufium*, with the proper names *Rufus*, *Rufinus*⁷, &c., seems to shew that *rufus* "red" was borrowed by the Romans, their own word being *ruber*. The root from which the two forms came is certainly RUDH, the Sanskrit *rudhira*, Greek *ἐ-ρυθ-ρός*, our "red:" *ruber* therefore shews us that in Latin *b* can represent medial DH; as we see also from *uber* (*οὐθαρ*, "udder")—but *Ufens*, *Aufidus*, in different parts of Italy; from *uerbum*, a "word,"

In Latin the h was commonly dropped in the middle of a word.

¹ *Krit. Beitr.* 212, &c.

² Corssen i. 146.

³ See p. 139.

⁶ See p. 200.

³ See p. 161.

⁵ Corssen, i. 147.

⁷ Corssen, i. 151.

and *barba*, a "beard:" in these last two words the traces of original DH are preserved by the Teutonic languages with great fidelity, and by them only.

It is clear then that both DH and BH were regularly represented in Italy by *f*: though the Latin alone preferred the more distinct *d* and *b* within a word. At an early period the DH must have passed into *bh* in Italy: so that from original *rudhira* came the old Italian *rubhro*, which then split into Italian *rufro* and Latin *rubro* just on the same analogy (as Curtius points out¹) as old Italian *tibhi* (where BH is original, compare Sanskrit *tubhyam*) split into Umbrian *tefe*, Latin *tibi*. This weakening of *dh* to *bh* is neither impossible nor unnatural: we have already seen how inexactly *d* was sounded in Latin, so that it could pass into both *l* and *r*. But I think we may believe that the breath at the end of each aspirate was somewhat strongly sounded in Latin, so that the distinction between the *b* and the *d* was not appreciable, and therefore they sank to the same spirant *f*. This view appears to me to be supported by the fact that *f* from *bh* sometimes passes into *h*: as in *harena* for the old Italian and Sabine *fasena*: *haba* exists by the side of *faba*: *herba* is most likely from $\sqrt{b}har$, compare $\phi\omicron\rho\beta\eta^2$; and *mihi* undoubtedly stands for *mibhi*, the loss of the *b* being possibly due, as Curtius suggests, to the dissimilating influence of the labial *m*. Now there are tolerable indications that *h* was a strong sound in the old Latin: although in the Augustan age no doubt it had grown weak³, and was constantly dropped, as in (*h*)*anser*, (*h*)*olus*, &c. But the strength of the breath in former times, when the changes between different classes took place, would be a good reason for the change between strong *h* and *f* with a strong breathing. And the same conclusion may be drawn from the occasional substitution of *f* for GH mentioned above. I pass now to the more regular changes of GH, to complete the history of the aspirates.

¹ *Zeitsch.* II. 334.² Corssen, I. 102. . .³ *Id.* I. 106, &c.

GH is generally represented by *g* when not initial. Thus *ang-or* is from AGH, whence ἄχος, &c.; *lig-urio* is from LIGH (λείχω); so also *anguis*, *unguis*, *ningit*, &c. have lost the *h*¹; when it stands at the beginning of a word as in *gramen*, *granum*, *grando*, &c., it seems to be generally followed by *r*, which absorbed the breath but left the *g*². Initial GH is regularly represented by *h*; as *hiemps* (GHI, whence χι-ών, &c.), *heri* (Sanskrit *hyas* for *ghyas*, Greek χθής where the *θ* is peculiar³), *hostis* (from GHAS, whence our "guest:" *hospes* may not improbably be the "protector of strangers," *ghas-pati* from PA: *gospoda* is a "host" in Polish⁴), and many others. H is even found at the end of a root in *veh* and *trah*⁵: I have already said⁶ that the *h* here must have been strongly guttural, or it could not have changed to *c* in *uec-tum*, *trac-si*. These, with the irregular initial *f*, are the substitutes of GH.

From these facts we see that the aspirates, when medial, are regularly represented by the corresponding unaspirated softs in Latin (though not in common Italian); when initial they are represented by a sound which was originally no doubt a weak aspirate, but was probably at an early time no more than a spirant or breathing: nay more, the one single sound *f* can stand for all the original aspirates, probably, as I have suggested, from this being pronounced with a strong breath, which neutralised the distinction of class. This variation has nothing in it contrary to the usual character of phonetic change.

Corssen suggests⁷ that it may have been caused by an "irrational" *u* springing up after the letter, so that *gh* and *dh* should become respectively *ghũ* and *dhũ*, then both turn to *fũ* and so to *f*. This is very possible: and is supported, at least for *gh*, by the forms *anguis* (originally

The aspirates when initial pass into breaths, when medial into soft letters.

¹ *Comp.* 245.

² See Grassmann, *Zeitsch.* XII. 89, &c.

³ See *Gr. Et.* 454.

⁴ Benfey, *Gr. Wurz. Lexicon*, II. 210.

⁵ The gutturals are preserved in A. S. *wegan*, to carry, "weigh" anchor; and English "drag."

⁶ p. 132.

⁷ I. 160.

CH. VIII.

Explanation of the appearance of the soft letters.

aghi-s) and *brevis*, i.e. *breghu-is*; also by the analogous springing up of *u* after *g*, as *ting-u-o*, *ning-u-o*.

But how are we to account for the appearance of *g*, *d*, and *b*? These are stronger forms than *gh*, *dh*, *bh*: and yet there is no apparent reason for any strengthening. I suggest the following explanation. We have seen that the Graeco-Italians brought with them into Europe the aspirates *gh*, *dh*, *bh*: sounds which have been explained as soft letters followed by a breath. Such pronunciation is still retained in India. But it does not seem to have suited any European nation. Among the Graeco-Italians the breath appears to me to have changed into the spiritus asper; whatever the difference in sound between the original breath and the spiritus asper was originally, it must have been very slight, consequently the change could not be difficult. Such a change seems to me to explain the subsequent history of the aspirates in Greek and Latin. The aspirate had become really a double sound: and the two component parts acted upon each other. In Greek (as we shall see) the second part assimilated the first. In Latin one part drove the other out and so caused loss: at the beginning of a word the first part fell away (conformably to the regular Latin usage, as we shall see hereafter), wholly in *gh*, perhaps with some slight remnant of sound in *bh*, both when original, and when it represented *dh*: when the aspirate was not initial, Italian usage differed; the Latins preferred to retain the first part, though even among them *f* is sometimes found: the rest of Italy kept the *f* here also. I may add that the difference in the Greek and the Italian methods is quite in accordance with the usual treatment of compound sounds in the two languages.

Corssen¹ regards the Latin *b* as produced from the Italian *f*: of *g* he gives, I think, no other explanation than that it is "aus *gh* verschoben²." No doubt we might have

¹ I. 140,

² I. 91.

expected to find *f* universal throughout Italy; but we do not so find it, unless we agree with Corssen that Latin *b* comes through the middle step *f*: and, apparently to explain the strengthening, he suggests that this *b* is here a weaker sound, more like the Greek β^1 . But where is there any proof of this? He has himself shewn elsewhere that Latin *b* is the "ordinary labial media²." Surely it is at least equally permissible to regard the Latin *b* as a dialectical variation, dating from the earliest times. Indeed I am entirely unable to enter into Corssen's view of the origin of the *f*. He believes³ that the Italians did not bring *bh* with them into the peninsula. Then they must have brought *f*. But whence did they bring it? The Greeks have no such sound: it must have been developed after the separation of the two races, and therefore presumably in Italy. Corssen argues that there is no trace of *bh* in Italy at all. But, according to my view, *b* is a distinct trace of it. Secondly, he says that no European nation had kept the *bh*. But the Greeks must have done so; else where did they get their ϕ ? Whatever may be the reason of the hard aspirates in Greek, there can be no doubt that they were derived in some way from the soft aspirates. Lastly, if the Italians did not bring *bh* with them, why did they bring *gh*? This Corssen probably admits to be Italian, for he does not derive *g* from *h*. But surely *gh* and *bh* stand or fall together⁴.

Thus then the forms under which the aspirates in the middle of a word are represented in Latin, result partly from Loss, if my view be correct, or from irregular Substitution, according to Corssen: the initial forms are probably produced by indistinct articulation. But, as I said above,

¹ I. 171.² I. 126.³ I. 140.

⁴ In the same page, where Corssen denies the existence of *bh* in Italy, he makes the strange statement that the Zend alone of all the Indo-Germanic languages has preserved the *bh*. He here most unaccountably overlooks the Sanskrit; and the Zend (at least according to Schleicher's *Compendium*) has not preserved the *bh*, which it represents by *b* and *w*.

since the reason for the changes cannot be certainly assigned, I have preferred to consider them under the most general head.

5. *Substitution of a Vowel for a Consonant.*

α for ν.

This is very rare. It is found in Ionic forms such as *ἔστάλαται* for *ἔσταλνται*, where the combination of consonants was almost impossible to be pronounced. Upon the analogy of these forms others sprung up without the same excuse; as *βεβλέαται* for *βέβληνται*, though there is no apparent difficulty in the combination *ντ*. Indeed in Doric Greek it was substituted for *λτ*; thus we find *φίντατος* for *φίλτατος*, *κέντο* for *κέλετο*, *ἐνθεῖν* for *ἐλθεῖν*¹.

υ for λ.

In Cretan occurs a change of *λ* into *υ*. The forms depend on grammarians only; but we find quoted *αῦσος* for *ἄλσος*, *αὐκά* for *ἄλκη*, *αὐγεῖν* for *ἄλγεῖν*, *εὐθεῖν* for *ἐλθεῖν*. This is interesting from its analogy to the change in French (in the 12th century²) by which *l* passed into *u*; as *albus*, *aube*; *agnellus*, *agneau*; *falsus*, *fauz*, &c. The same change is found in English in some Romance words, but also in a few of Teutonic origin: e.g. in *hawse*, a word in common use in Cumberland for a mountain-pass, which was originally *hals*, a throat or neck: compare the French *col*.

II. Loss.

1. *Loss of Aspiration in Greek.*

This subject may be taken first under the head of Loss, since the result is the same as that which we have been discussing in the last section—the loss of the breathing which is the second component of the aspirates. But this result is much less frequent in Greek than in Latin.

¹ e.g. Theok. II. 66.

² See Brachet, *French Dict.* (tr. Kitchin) § 157.

This loss only sporadic in Greek though regular in Latin.

Loss of the *h* is not the common end of the Greek aspirates; it occurs in very few certain cases, which are thoroughly examined by Curtius¹. But the principle seems to me the same as that which operates regularly in Latin in the middle of a word; though its action in the Greek is only irregular.

Loss of the breathing is generally assumed in *γένος*, *ἐγώ*, and *μέγας*: the corresponding consonant in Sanskrit in all these is *h* for *gh*: so that *gh* would seem to be the original letter, did not the Gothic shew us *kinnus*, *ik*, and *mikils* (Scotch "mickle"): and the *k* here points to *g* as the original, and to *gh* as being a Sanskrit weakening. Cases in which BH has turned to β under the influence of a preceding nasal are rather the results of assimilation: e.g. *θάμβος* (if this be from $\sqrt{\tau\alpha\phi}$), *ῥμβρος* (Sanskrit *abhra*); they are few in all. It seems to me that the undoubted cases of pure loss are confined to the hard aspirates which, as we have already seen, are peculiarly Greek developments, where the second part, the spiritus asper, was likely enough to drop off and be lost. Thus we have the roots *ὀρυχ* and *κρυφ*, &c. (as seen in *ὀρύσσω*, *κρύφα*), but *ὀρυγή* and *κρύπτω*²: we have $\sqrt{\alpha\lambda\theta}$ but *ἀλδαίνω* (though here *αλθ* and *αλδ* may be secondaries of $\sqrt{\alpha\lambda}$, and so Curtius takes them); $\sqrt{\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\theta}$ but *ἐπίλυδ-*; *βρέμειν* by the side of *fremere*, and not impossibly *φόρμιγξ*: *λαμβάνειν* but *λάφυρον* and *ἀμφι-λαφ-ής*; here also the Sanskrit has \sqrt{labh} . Why this tendency to drop the rough breathing should act just on these few words and not on others we cannot explain: all sporadic change is capricious; we can do no more than assign a plausible cause for it; perhaps here the rolling sound of *ρ* and *λ* (one of which occurs in all the words) may have been strong enough to cause the rough breathing to be felt not necessary though optional; just as we saw that *h* was dropped from an original aspirate followed by *r* in *gramen*, &c. in Latin.

¹ *Gr. Et.* 476, &c.

² *Ib.* 481.

Curtius remarks¹ that this change in Greek was not likely to be frequent; the tendency in Greek lies the other way, as we shall hereafter see. To this opposite tendency are due the forms δέχομαι, τεύχω, &c. by the side of δέκομαι, τύκ-ος; αὔθις from the Homeric αὐτις, &c.; in all these cases the Ionic has kept the original form, not weakened a stronger one. But there is certainly weakening in cases like the Ionic ἀπ' οὐ: not of course in the preposition but in the pronoun, which loses its rough breathing in pronunciation to suit the Ionic love of soft sounds, though the symbol was retained in writing, to avoid confusion.

2. *Loss of one or more out of a group of Consonants.*

Possible
origin of
these
groups.

This is, perhaps, the most natural form of loss. Heavy masses of consonants become unendurable in all languages, though all do not deal with them in the same way. It is true that they often seem to be radical; and therefore it might be argued that what our fathers could endure might have been endured by their children. But in reply to this, I may say, that in roots which contain groups of consonants, e.g. STA or SRU, it is very probable we have not reached to the ultimate simplest form. Ultimate it is to our analysis however, and will probably remain so. I know that some philologists contend that all roots originally consisted of a single consonant and vowel, or even of a single vowel. This is very possible, but if we attempt to cut down the roots into simpler forms to suit this theory, we are simply engaging in a task for which we have no sufficient data, no guide but the analogy of actually occurring simple forms to which we endeavour to make our more complex roots correspond. On the other hand, though in most cases we cannot discover what these simplest forms actually were, this is no reason for

¹ Gr. Et. 476.

concluding that there were no simpler forms. Analogy is deceptive if we attempt to analyse; but the fact, that we can with tolerable certainty resolve some compound roots into simpler forms¹, is an indication that such simpler forms may exist for others, though we cannot discover them. Thus it is possible that SRU may have been at an earlier time SAR-U², the U being a formative suffix: then the A may have fallen out, leaving SRU, a sound convenient to Hindus, Lithuanians, and Germans, but inconvenient to Graeco-Italians, as we shall see. But such a simpler form, though possible, is quite uncertain; I only give it to shew that such heavy consonantal roots may themselves have been the result of phonetic change acting in times far beyond our limited range of vision.

Sometimes these consonant-groups were certainly not radical but caused by combining roots and suffixes; sometimes even by the involuntary springing-out of a parasitic sound after the original consonant. But however they were produced, they were governed by the same laws. I shall therefore not dwell on their origin here, reserving the account of parasitic sounds. I shall consider the loss under three heads; initial, medial, and final. It is never very common in the Greek, because, as I have already said, the Greeks preferred where possible to assimilate one sound to the other. In Latin it is always common; but, as might be expected, generally sporadic.

In Greek no consonants seems to be lost at the beginning of a word except the spirants *s* and *v*; and even these fall out generally before a protracted, rarely before a momentary sound. Thus *s* is lost in $\sqrt{\rho\nu}$ for $\sqrt{\sigma\rho\nu}$; *νύξ* for *σνύξ* (page 144, where it was suggested that the oldest form was *sunusa*); *μέριμνα*, Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{smar}}$; *νίφα* from SNIGH, Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{snih}}$; *νευρά* (in German *schnur*, our “snare”); *μειδιάω* (Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{smi}}$, our “smile,” with a different determinative consonant), &c. Probably φίλος

i. Initial loss: principally of *s* and *v* both in Greek and Latin.

¹ See, for example, pp. 45—47.

² For SAR, see p. 161.

CH. VIII.

is for *σφίλος*, and was originally *σφείλος* from the primary base *σφε-γο*, seen in Homeric *σφέος*, (as *κτίλις* is formed through *κτεος*, from $\sqrt{\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}}$ originally $\sqrt{\kappa\tau\alpha}$): the loss of *σ* is natural here, because *φ* is for original *υ* (*sva*); and the word had therefore been irregularly increased in volume: and this derivation explains (as no other does) the familiar Homeric use of *φίλος* in such phrases as *φίλον ἦτορ*, *φίλα βλέφαρα*, &c.¹ When the loss occurs before *κ* or *π* traces are also often left of the fuller sound; thus we have both *σκάπτω* and *κάπετος*, *σκῦτος* and *κύτος*, *σπαίρω* and *πάλλω*, *σπέλεθος* and *πέλεθος*: it is rather common before *τ*, as *ταῦρος* (by the German *stier*), *στέγος* and *τέγος*, &c. Nearly all these changes, it will be observed, are Graeco-Italian, and may very likely have taken place before the separation. The second consonant would seem to be lost in *σύν* for *σκύν*: *ξύν* shews misplacement of the *σκ* just as *σπ* was liable to change to the commoner *πσ* (*ψ*): *κυν*, however, is preserved in the name *Κυνουρία* (i. e. *confinia*²). It has been already pointed out that the older form is sometimes evidenced by apparent irregularities of scansion in Homer, as *ἐπὶ νευρῇ*, where the length of the *ι* is probably due to the surviving trace of the *s*; sometimes by assimilation, as *φιλο-μμειδής*, where the first *μ* is the old *σ*: and hence came arbitrary lengthenings or doublings of consonants by the minstrels on the analogy of these etymologically correct forms, as *ὑπὸ νέφεος*, *ἔμμαθε*, &c. These examples are taken from Curtius³.

Original *υ* is lost in *ρίζα* for *φρίζα*, the O. H. G. *wurza*, and modern "wurzel," English "wort;" *ράκος* is from *VRAK*. Since the Latins had *radix* by *ρίζα*, and *lacer*, perhaps *lacerna*, by *ράκος*, this loss also would seem to be Graeco-

¹ See Curtius, *Studien*, vi. 427.

² In all these cases the *s* seems to have been Indo-European; but it is possible that it may have been prefixed in primitive times to original *t*, and that the double forms are therefore both original. A prefixed *s* seems tolerably certain in many English words, as *screech*, *scratch*, *scrunch*, *snarl*, *sneeze*, *snore*, &c.

³ *Erläut.* p. 46 (Engl. trans.); and see above, p. 33.

Italian. The same is not true of ῥήγνυμι, Latin *frango*; this form is curious. The oldest form of the root seems to be BHRAG, for the Gothic is *brikan*, to "break:" then this BH irregularly weakened itself to F¹, evidenced by Aeolic Φρήξις, which vanished in common Greek: the Latin form is regular². But with this exception it would appear that these losses of initial spirants were no peculiarity of the Greek; they were rather due to a tendency which was acting in Graeco-Italian times, and never ceased in Latin, but which was almost stopped by the Greeks when left to themselves. The Greeks have no objection to hard combinations, like σκ, στ, σπ, at the beginning of a word; they dislike the amalgamation of different consonants *within* a word.

In Latin the regular loss is also of *s* and *v*. No real Latin word begins with *sr*, *sn*, or *sm*³; hence we have (parallel to the Greek losses given above) *riuus* from SRU, *nurus*, *memor* for *sme-smor*, *nix* for *snigh-uis*, *neruos*, perhaps *mi-rus* from SMI, &c.; there is also no initial *sl*, so that *limus* may be our "slime⁴." Corssen⁵ adds another to the possible etymologies of the much-contested "Rome," by deriving it from SRU (*Srouma*), the "stream-town," and explains the name by reference to the insulated condition of the old Roma quadrata on the Palatine, before the Tiber was kept within its banks. From the same root he also very plausibly derives Reate (*Sreu-ate*) in the high constantly inundated valley first drained by Curius Dentatus. Sometimes *s* has fallen out before *f*, as *funda* (= σφενδόνη), *fides* (a string, Greek σφίδη), *fallo*, by σφάλλω.

Passing to the momentary sounds we shall find *s* lost principally before *t*; in *torus* (Gk. √στορ), *tego* (στέγω), *te-*

¹ This weakening occurs also in √Fay (Sk. *bhanj*); but in no other word.

² *Gr. Et.* No. 656.

³ Even some borrowed words lose it in Latin, as *myrrha* (σμέρρα).

⁴ *Krit. Beitr.* 429; but see *Gr. Et.* 342.

⁵ *Krit. Beitr.* 428.

metum, tundo, torpeo, turgeo, and many others¹. Corssen, against Curtius and Max Müller, would derive *ton-itrū* from STAN, found in Greek στένω². Sometimes *s* is lost before *c*, as in *caueo* (SKAV), *cutis* by σκῦτος and κύτος, is from SKU, whence comes also *cauos*, and perhaps *caelum*; *culter* is from SKAR, our "shear;" *casa* may be (sc)*ad-sa*³ for *scad-ta*, the past participle of SKAD, "to cover," Sanskrit √*chhad*. *S* may have fallen out before *p* in *penuria* (σπάνις) and *pituita* (πυτίζω) from √*spu* + *tu*, a lengthened form of SPU (in *spuere*), in *parcus, pannus, parra*, and the derivatives of SPAL. Sometimes *st* falls away entirely before *l*, as in *lis, locus* (the form *stlocus* points to STAL), and *latus* (*stlatus* being the past participle of STAR, "to strew," and meaning that which is strewn, scattered, widened). Hence the distinction between *navis stlata*, a vessel built broad for merchandise, and *navis longa*, the man-of-war⁴.

V is lost in much the same words as in the Greek: *lacer* and *radix* are given above; *lupus* may perhaps be the Sanskrit *vrika*; and *ros* (Fέρση, or έρση) is connected with √*vriśh*. Sometimes, but rarely, the lost *v* is the second letter, as in *canis*: (κύων, Sanskrit *çvan*); and *v* is lost, though not without leaving its trace, in a rather large list of Latin words, where original *va* has passed into *o*: such are *soror* (Sanskrit *svasrī*), *socer* (original *svakura*), *sonus* (Sanskrit *svana*), *sopor* (root: √*vap*), &c. The Greek is quite irregular in such of these words as it has retained, έκυρός, ύπνος, &c.

Besides this somewhat regular loss of *s* and *v* we find sporadic loss of initial mutes:

of *c* before *v*, in *uermis*, Sk. *krimi*, and Gothic *vaurm-s*⁵; probably in *uapor* (καπνός, the *u* being parasitic).

before *l*, in *lamentum* (*clamor*, &c.), *laus* (√*clu*).

¹ Corssen, l. 278.

² Krit. Beitr. 448.

³ Id. 2.

⁴ See p. 109.

⁵ Id. 462.

of G before *v*, in *uenter* (γαστήρ), and *uorare*¹, *uenire* (√*gva*, whence Greek βαίνειν, Gothic *kvi-man*²).

before *n*, in *notus*, *nomen*, *narrare*, *nitor*.

of T before *l*, apparently in *latus* for *tlatus* (√*tol*).

of D before *r*, assumed by Corssen³ in *ruere* and *racemus* (Sk. *draksha*); but in neither case is the connection certain.

before *v*, in *uiginti* from *dvi*: compare *bis* (*duis*), *bellum* (*duellum*).

before *y*, in (*D*)*iouis*, (*D*)*ianus*, (*d*)*ianuā*.

of P before *l*, in *laetus* for *plaetus* (compare Sanskrit *prīta*), *lātus* (πλάτος), perhaps *lanx* (πλάξ); *lauere* (λούειν) may be from PLU, which occurs in Sanskrit and Greek πλύνειν⁴.

Connected with this initial loss is the frequent misplacement of consonants in groups at the beginning of a word. Thus *καρδία* is Latin *cord*-; from √*bhrak* (φράσσω) comes *farcio*, and many other cases occur of a consonant thus thrown forward to avoid a heavy consonantal beginning. In some, no doubt, it is not quite certain how the consonants were placed in the radical form; but the general tendency is unmistakeable.

I may also mention here the curious loss of *c* (κ), not in compounds, but standing alone at the beginning of some pronominal words, as (*c*)*ubi*, (*c*)*uti*, (*c*)*unde*: the *c* is preserved in *ali-cubi*, *ali-(c)unde*, &c. Other supposed losses, as *aper* (κάπρος), *amo* (Sk. *kam*), seem to be uncertain. No other consonant seems to fall away similarly; the reason here is quite uncertain. Forms like ἐγείρω in Greek are sometimes explained as instances of mutilated reduplication, i.e. γεγείρω: this is possible; perhaps in a very few cases initial γ may have been the continuous

Loss of initial *c* when standing alone.

¹ See p. 126.

² *Id.* 142.

³ See *Krit. Beitr.* 27—64.

⁴ *Krit. Beitr.* 150.

CH. VIII.

ii. Medial
loss:
hardly
found in
Greek,

sound (nearly *y*) which represents it in modern Greek; but I incline to think that the vowel is prosthetic.

Loss in the middle of a word is rarer. It is hardly found in Greek. Schleicher gives as an example *τέρυφ-(σ)θε*, where the accumulation of consonants was doubtless too much for the Greek feeling of euphony. Dentals are sometimes lost out of medial compounds, as in *πάσα*, i.e. *παντ-γα*, *φρά(δ)σω*, &c. A single consonant, *τ*, falls out regularly in the 3rd pers. sing. of verbs, as *φέρε(τ)ι*, and in nouns, as *κέρα(τ)-ος*. Also *ν* is dropped in the termination of a base, as in *μείζoves*, *μείζους*, and *μείζονα*, *μείζω*. These are perhaps further consequences of the Greek dislike to momentary sounds at or near the end of a word. Original *bh* seems to have fallen out at least in the dual gen. and dat., if we compare the Sanskrit termination *-bhyām*; a slightly older form is preserved in the Epic *ᾠμοιν*, *ποδοῖν*, &c. It is preserved in the plural in the Epic *ναῦφι*, &c.: the later dative is, doubtless, a weakening of the locative. There is no reason to assume that *φ* (*bh*) has been dropped, in *οἴκοι* and the like, as though the original form were *οἴκοφι*: the first is a true locative, the second an instrumental case, and quite distinct from the first. These losses in terminations are highly irregular, and can give no warrant for us to expect similar losses in radical syllables; brevity and convenience of sound are especially necessary in suffixes, which are therefore more corrupted than any other elements of language.

In Latin the examples are tolerably numerous, but they are hard to reduce to rule. Schleicher considers that they are the results of assimilation: the lost letter has been first assimilated, and then vanished in accordance with the old Latin rule of not writing the same letter twice¹. This is a very ingenious theory, and may be true; but it is simplest to treat the results under the general head of Loss. I take the examples from Schleicher and Corssen. This loss occurs most frequently before spirants:

¹ *Comp.* 258. The same rule exists in Spanish.

common
and irre-
gularly in
Latin.

before *s*, as *di(c)-sco*, *mul(g)-si*; *spar(g)-sus* (from *sparg-tus*), *miles* (for *milit-s*), *sua(d)-si*; *ce(n)sor* and *co(n)sol* (in old Latin, but the old forms were replaced in the later writing¹) so also *quotie(n)s*, *ru(r)sum*, and many others.

before *y*, as *ma(g)-ior*, *se(d)-iungo*, *pe(r)-iero*, *tra(ns)-icio*, &c.

before *v*, as *bre(gh)-u-is*, *le(gh)-u-is*, *sua(d)-u-is*, &c.

It is common also before nasals:

before *n*, as *lu(c)-na*, *pi(c)-nus*, *de(c)-nus*, *ua(c)-nus*, *aranea* (ἀράχνη), *ce(s)-na*, *po(s)no*, *ca(s)-nus*.

before *m*, as *lu(c)-men*, *li(c)-mus*, *sti(g)-mulus*, *exa(g)-men*, *u(g)-mor*, perhaps *fla-(g)men*, *re(s)-mus*, *Ca(s)-mena*, *po(s)-moerium*.

It occurs before *l* apparently in *te(x)-la* and *corpu(s)-lentus*. Loss is hardly found before any momentary consonant except the dentals; thus

before *t*, in passive participles, as *tor(c)tus*, *ul(c)tus*, *ful(c)tus*, *far(c)tus*, *sar(c)tus*; in all these the group consists of at least *three* consonants.

before *d*, the loss being restricted to *s* (except, apparently, *pedo*, πῆδω), as *iu(s)-dex*, *i(s)-dem*, *di(s)-duco*.

In all these cases it will be observed that the loss is

¹ The *n* is dropped not only before *s*, but also (in the prefix *in*) before *gn*; so *i(n)gnominia*, *i(n)gnorare*, &c. Doubtless this is due to the following *n*. It is probable however that the vowel was nasalised: this would account for the grammarian's rule that a vowel was long before the termination *-gno-*: this is sometimes etymologically true as in *regnum*, but not in such a form as *beni-gnus*: now a nasal vowel can of course be prolonged. Traces of this may be found in later Latin spellings, e.g. in *singnifer*, &c.

A similar loss of *n* before *s* is not uncommon in the Northern languages. Thus we have Norse *gás* for *gans* and our "goose:" "dust" for *dunst* has been already mentioned: also before *th*, as in our "tooth" for *toonth*, original *danta*.

CH. VIII.

iii. Final
loss.

confined to the last letter of the root or prefix. The Latin tendency to weaken the end of a word seems to have extended even to the separate syllables.

Loss at the end of a word extends to single consonants, as well as to combinations of them. I have already mentioned Prof. Benfey's doctrine that the accent seems to be thrown back as soon as the consciousness of the relative value of the different parts of a word becomes obliterated. It is not improbable that the personal terminations of the verb bore the stress as well as the accent originally (as in $\phi\eta\mu\iota$), and continued to do so as long as the $\mu\iota$ was distinctly felt to be the pronoun "I," which limited the idea of "speaking," to a single person, the speaker: but when this fact ceased to be felt, and $\mu\iota$ was no more than a grammatical suffix, the two syllables, which formerly existed side by side with some sort of mutual independence, became fused together, and the stress fell back, as the accent generally did¹. This loss of emphasis would make the last syllable comparatively unimportant, and liable to phonetic corruption: and this corruption is found, apparently, in proportion to the inability of a language to accent the last syllable: and therefore Latin, which never accentuates the last syllable, has suffered more on the whole from loss than Sanskrit or Greek: this we have already seen in the shortening and loss of its final vowels, and shall now see again in its consonantal loss. The sounds thus lost will of course differ much for different languages: one people found a final sound difficult which presented no difficulty to another; thus the Greeks liked final *s*, which the Italians slurred over, weakened, and finally lost. But the principle is the same for all languages: final unemphatic syllables have a tendency to weaken or drop their difficult sounds.

¹ In those words where the final syllable is weakened, yet the accentual mark remains on the weakened syllable, such as $\phi\eta\mu\iota$, $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\varsigma$, &c., it seems reasonable to suppose that the force-accent, or stress, was taken off the last syllable, while the pitch-accent (denoted by the mark) remained. I have already pointed out that there is no necessary connection between the two; see page 213, and compare page 321.

In one respect at least the final syllable in Greek seems to have suffered more than in Latin. It is more monotonous, a great sign of weakness in language. As is well known, the Greeks allowed no consonant to end a word but the light sounding ν (into which the common Graeco-Italian m of verbal and nominal suffixes was therefore changed), σ , and rarely ρ : so final consonants were either dropped altogether, $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha(\tau)$, $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon(\tau)$, Sanskrit *abhūt*; $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\alpha$, Sanskrit *adiksham*; $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$, (*patrem*); or softened, as dentals into σ : e.g. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$; or μ into ν , as $\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu$ ¹. Latin, on the contrary, allows considerable variety of final consonants. But there is no monotony in the final *vowels* of the Greek, whereas, as we have seen, in Latin a final vowel tends to sink to e . The vivid life of the Greek vowels overpowered the final consonant or consonants, and reduced them to absolute uniformity, or completely extinguished them. The power of the vowel over the consonant in Greek, which is seen here, may be contrasted with the power of the consonant in Latin to assimilate the vowel²: nothing could better shew the difference in the genius of the languages.

When a group of consonants ended a word, they were sometimes all dropped, as in $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha(\kappa\tau)$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ vocative of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\tau$; generally the last was retained, $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ($\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\varsigma$), $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma+\varsigma$), with compensatory lengthening of the vowel, the vowel-sound being naturally prolonged to fill up the gap of the missing consonant. Sometimes however the first consonant was kept with the same lengthening of the vowel, probably from analogy, as $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\varsigma$), $\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ ($\pi\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma$); I infer that the first method is the older, from the probability of forms like $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ($\delta\iota\delta\acute{o}\nu\tau\varsigma$) being older than $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\varsigma$): but how the change arose I cannot say.

The effects of this frequent loss of dentals and spirants on the Greek vocalism have been already mentioned

¹ *Comp.* 236, &c.² See pp. 299—307.

CH. VIII.

The ν ἐφέλ-
κυστικόν.

under the head of the Greek diphthongs. It is certainly the most distinguishing mark of the Greek consonantal system¹. The loss of the spirants themselves was considered under the head of Substitution.

A curious phenomenon in connection with the subject is the ν ἐφέλκυστικόν. This is in its origin no mere poetic license, though it may have been afterwards metrically useful. It seems to me to have been rather a sort of "after-sound," resembling the Sanskrit Anusvâra, a feeble echo supplying the place of a lost consonant, probably resembling the sound of the French nasal after a vowel, rather than the clear dental nasal. Thus λέγομεν, which is still found in Doric, was doubtless the old Greek form, parallel to *legimus*: then the *s* fell away, and left λέγομε: the final syllable was then thickened in pronunciation, and so became finally λέγομεν; where it is not to be supposed that ν is a substitute for σ², but, as I said, a new "after-sound," produced after a weak termination: which could afterwards, when convenient, be sounded in places where no consonant had been lost, as λέγουσιν, probably in consequence of the strong nasalizing propensity of the Greeks³. Schleicher (*ib.*) points out that the loss of final *s*, though rare in Greek, is paralleled by οὔτω(ς), &c.

Greater
range in
Latin.

In Latin—at least as we know it through the Roman writers—there was no such dislike to the accumulation of consonants at the end of a word as we have seen in Greek. Any number of consonants which could be pronounced was allowed. Thus—to borrow examples from

¹ In Norse the defect is of the gutturals. "Even in writing the contraction is not marked [e.g. *þo*=*doch* though: *þjo*=thigh: *má*=might (verb)], the change having taken place long before writing began: whereas in English, although the same phonetic change has taken place, the old Saxon spelling is still kept, because the change is of much later date, [15 cent.?] when the old sound was fixed in writing." Cleasby, *Icel. Dict.* p. xxx.

² See Schleicher, *Comp.* 238.

³ Cf. Quintilian, xii. 10. 31: *Graeci n litteram "iucundam et in fine praecipue quasi tinnientem ponunt."*

Schleicher¹—we have *ferunt, hunc, hiemps, urbs, &c.*; all of which are impossible to the Greek ear. The only exceptions seem to be these: that no double consonant is permissible, e.g. we have *os* and *fel*, but the genitives *ossis* and *fellis*: and that no two mutes are allowed: thus we have *lac(t)*, compare *γαλα(κτ)*, &c.²

But in the older Latin—the spoken Latin of which Plautus is the written representative—which, as we have so often seen, continued to be the language of the people, even when Virgil and Horace were delighting the literary circles of Rome with verses which must have been read in a manner widely different from the pronunciation of common life: in this Latin final consonants were regularly dropped: they were often actually omitted upon inscriptions, not merely ceased to be audibly pronounced as in the Romance languages, where they have been fixed by literature even when unheard in conversation. The consonants which most frequently fell away in this manner are the most common final letters *s*, *m*, and *t*. For the loss of these Schleicher gives the following examples.

Final *s* is dropped upon inscriptions in nominative cases, like *Tetio(s)*, *Furio(s)*, *Cornelio(s)*. In the older inscriptions, those of the Second Punic war, it is much less often written than dropped³: though when the *o* in these nominatives was weakened to *u*, the *s* seems to have been regularly retained. By the beginning of the Empire, *s* even preceded by *u* was often lost on inscriptions: and a few centuries later, *s* had vanished from every case as well as from the nominative. In written Latin of the classical age, as we know, the *s* was generally kept. Still even here there are plenty of instances where its loss in writing shews how little it was commonly heard. Such are forms like *amabare* by the side of *amabarīs*, and similar losses in other tenses: forms also like *mage* and *pote* for *magis* and *potis*. And it was regularly dropped in other forms, only a few traces surviving in Plautus; or

Loss of
final *s*.

¹ *Comp.* 270.

² *Ib.* 271.

³ Corssen, i. 286.

CH. VIII.

in words, which from some old association retained their archaic form. Thus *s* was regularly dropped in the nominative plural of the *o*-declension. Yet we find *hisce homines* in Plautus¹, *magistreis*, *publiceis*, &c. on inscriptions. In the genitive of the *a*-declension we have *familiae*, yet sometimes the older *familiā(i)s*. And lastly, through previous loss of the vowel of the termination, we have *pueros*, *puers*, *puer*.

Loss of
final *m*.

For the omission of final *m* on inscriptions we need not go farther than the often-quoted epitaph of Scipio, the consul of A.U.C. 495. This begins, as given by Mommsen in the *Corpus*,

Honc oino ploirume cosentient B[omani]

Duonoro optumo fuisse uiro [uiro—*e conj. Ritschl.*]

Luciom Scipione, &c.

Here the *m* is omitted five times, and written once: whether written or omitted the scanning seems to be the same. There can be no doubt that it was not heard, but continued in an irregular fashion to be written to prevent confusion of cases, &c., the reason why it was kept in later Latin. That it was hardly heard is shewn by its elision in the Augustan poets, but that it was not absolutely dumb is indicated by its occurring not elided in Lucretius², though it is possible that in such cases the preceding vowel could meet the initial of the following word without coalescing.

Loss of
final *t*.

Final *t*, as Schleicher points out, seems to have had the sound of weak *d*. As such it was sometimes written in the ablative case: as *Gnaiuod*, sometimes dropped altogether in the same line³, as *patre(d)*. *Haut* is sometimes *haud*, sometimes *hau*⁴. The late Latin shews the *t* written in personal terminations, as *uehit*: but the old

¹ *Trin.* 877, and Brix's note.

² At least in monosyllables; see III. 1082, and Munro's note on II. 404: see, on this question, A. J. Ellis, *Quantitative Pronunciation of Latin*, pp. 43—73.

³ Epitaph of Scipio.

⁴ Cf. loss in Icelandic of the final *t* in the negative suffix *-at*, e.g. *skalat* and *skala*, Cleasby, p. xxvi.

Latin often omitted it, as in *dede* for *dedit*, *dedro* for *ded(e)ront*; compare the classical *dederunt* and *dedere*. This loss was universal in Umbrian; as it was in the late Latin and the derived modern Italian. Indeed the loss of final consonants is felt much more in Umbrian than in Latin, but not in Oscan. Schleicher suggests reasonably enough that at the time from which our inscriptions date, a common form had established itself among the wide-spread Sabellian tribes, which became the literary dialect, and therefore ceased to vary further.

III. ASSIMILATION.

1. *The Greek Aspirates.*

I have already, in the account of the Latin aspirates, given the reason why I believe the Greek aspirates to be the result of assimilation. The change of the original breath to the spiritus asper seems to me to explain the changes of these letters in both Greek and Latin, whilst I know no other that does. The original pronunciation of the soft letter, followed by a breath, possible to the original people, possible to the Hindu, and to his descendants¹, was impossible to the nations of the West, who therefore changed the breath to the more familiar and very slightly different spiritus asper. Even in Sanskrit this occasionally took place; e.g. in *hita* for *dhita*, the past participle of \sqrt{dha} , and the root *han* for \sqrt{ghan} ; in these the breath has become the rough breathing, and expelled the *d* and *g*. In Latin we have seen that sometimes one member of the new compound was left, sometimes the other. The Greek followed its usual course. Instead of ejecting one of the sounds—a process, as we have seen, rare in Greek—it allowed the second to assimi-

¹ Thus Prof. Arendt (Kuhn and Schleicher's *Beiträge*, II. 289) declares that he has heard a Mohammedan, whose mother speech was Urdû, pronounce these sounds countless times without the slightest insertion of a vowel between the soft explosive sound and the *h*, and without the soft being changed into the corresponding hard.

Missing Page

CH. VIII.

shews the difference of sound between *f* and *φ*; in the Greek dissimilation was necessary to avoid cacophony. On the other hand, it must be allowed that two consecutive labial spirants would probably have been equally offensive to the Greeks. Curtius' second argument is the pronunciation of these sounds by foreigners, so far as we can judge from Aristophanes; e.g. ὄρνιτο παραδίδωμι, in the *Birds* (1679), or the speech of the Scythian in the *Thesmo-phoriazusae*:

πέρ' ἐγὼ 'ξενίγκι πορμός, ἵνα πυνλάξι σοι.

These may not be conclusive, but at least they shew that *θ* and *φ* imperfectly pronounced were more like *τ* and *π* than *th* and *f*. But the most convincing argument is certainly that drawn from Latin transliteration, at the time when they expressed the borrowed Greek words as well as they could with their own alphabet. If *χ* had been a guttural spirant, surely the Latins would have denoted it by their *h*, which, as we have seen, had still a guttural character. Yet we find on inscriptions *Bacanal*¹, *Antioco*², and many others. Similarly we find *p* in the place of *φ*, not *f*. It is true that *f* probably differed from *φ* in being a labio-dental, whereas *φ* was a pure labial; it may therefore be argued that *f* was ill-suited to express *φ*: and it may be said that the occurrence of ἐμφάλνειν and *imponere*, beside *inferre*, where *f* does not change *n* to *m*, is a further argument. But I quite allow that *f* was a more dental sound than *φ*; for this reason the dental nasal suffered no change: and at the very least, if *φ* had been a spirant, *f* was a nearer sound than *p*: but we have *Pilipus*³, *triumpe*, thrice repeated in the old Carmen Arvale⁴, *Trupo*⁵ (*Trypho*), &c. Again, the aspirate character of *φ*, as distinguished from *f*, is borne out by Quintilian's story of Cicero and the witness for Fundanius: he has been speaking of the use of *f* instead of *h* (in words like

¹ *Corpus*, n. 196.

² *Id.* n. 35.

³ *Id.* n. 354.

⁴ *Id.* n. 28.

⁵ *Id.* n. 1109.

fordeum) by previous generations, who used *f* “*pro aspiratione* [i.e. *h*] *velut simili littera: nam contra Graeci aspirare solent, ut pro Fundanio Cicero testem qui primam eius litteram dicere non possit, irridet*¹.” This can only mean that the witness said *Phundanius*; for it will scarcely be maintained that he said *Hundanius*: but that he used an *h* is expressly stated by Quintilian. The Latin has lost the dental spirant; therefore no certain inference can be drawn respecting *θ*: but, at all events, it always appeared as *t* (as in *Corintus*² and *Cartago*), not as *f*, the spirant which stands for *th* in Latin. These arguments from transliteration seem to me strong: the Latins in at least two cases possessed the spirants which would have represented the supposed Greek spirants at least more closely than the hards; and did not employ them. Again, when they finally chose to express *χ*, *θ*, and *φ* by *ch*, *th*, and *ph*, they must surely have intended to express thereby a real *προσθήκη πνεύματος*, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus attributes to the Greek sound. What else could Catullus mean to express by his form *Chommoda*, when he was ridiculing a man who called *insidias*—*hinsidias*, i.e. put in an *h* in wrong places? Next, the modern Greek in certain cases represents the old aspirates by hards, not, as commonly, by spirants; e.g. *έκω* for *έχω*, *τεκνίτης*. Now it is conceivable that original aspirates should produce sometimes spirants, sometimes hards; but difficult to conceive that original spirants should turn back to hards. Then too *f* as a very strong spirant (inter discrimina dentium *efflanda*) was able to represent not only the dental but even the guttural spirant³ in Latin. If then it could represent all spirants in Latin, why should it not have represented all three, *χ*, *θ*, *φ*, if they were spirants? Surely a superficial observer would have thought *f* at least as like to a spirant *χ*, as *c*, which he actually used. Lastly, it may be maintained (though

¹ I. iv. 14.² *Corpus*, n. 541.³ Just as with us it represents the guttural in *laugh*, &c., Roby, p. 23.

CH. VIII.

reasons drawn from names are apt to be deceptive), that the term *ψιλον* applied to π, τ, κ, expresses most naturally a sound "unaccompanied" by a breath, as distinguished from φ, θ, and χ: the Latin *tenuis* is a bad translation of the word. These arguments (principally of Curtius), which I have here given very briefly, seem to me as satisfactory as the case will allow of. My conclusion is that χ, θ, and φ were genuine hard aspirates at the prime of Greek literature, and that they were formed from the soft aspirates of the original speech by the assimilating influence of the spiritus asper, into which the original breathing passed¹.

*Slight
variations
in use.*

There is little variation in the regular use of the aspirates. The most remarkable is the loss of the breath, which, though not universal, is sufficiently common to be a characteristic of the Ionic dialect though found in the others also. The change of θ into σ in Laconian is also extensive: it is found on numerous inscriptions and in Alcman and the plays of Aristophanes. The same change has been wrongly attributed to the Boeotian on the authority of the MS. of Aristophanes only. The θ must have first passed into the imperfect *th* already mentioned, which closely resembles s. All other variations are sporadic: as the change of θ to φ in Lesbian, e.g. φήρ, φήριον;

¹ Mr Fennell, in a paper read before the Cambridge Philological Society, maintained that these sounds were spirants in classical Greek. Many of his arguments seem to me to have weight, and they are touched upon in the text above. On the question of transliteration he says: "Until the Romans became accurate, *p* was used for φ, as being more akin to it in sound than *f*. Similarly *c* was used for χ rather than *h*, which, though etymologically representing χ, must have partly lost its guttural character, for it also etymologically represents *f*. That to a superficial observer (a Roman) the Latin *c* should appear more like a spirant χ than did the Latin *h*, is not to be arbitrarily denied. That to a careful (Roman) observer the Latin *h* might seem inadequate to represent the sound of a spirant χ, is not on the face of it improbable." Mr Fennell thinks that when the Romans wished to have a diacritical symbol to represent φ, without using a symbol foreign to their alphabet, any educated Greek might have recommended *ph* because of the use of this compound on old inscriptions. All this appears to me quite possible: but I still think that the balance of probabilities leans towards the account given in the text.

it is likely that ϕ here was labio-dental: the Boeotian takes θ instead of τ with some regularity in the 3rd person plural, as $\epsilon\chi\omega\nu\theta\iota$ for $\epsilon\chi\omega\nu\tau\iota$; this dialect is throughout averse to assibilation. In Doric the breath is lost in a very few words¹: it is added to original hard letters in about as many more. The change of original gh to θ is certain in $\theta\epsilon\rho\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, but in no other word.

2. General rules of Assimilation in Greek.

Most of the changes of which I have here to speak are familiar from the Greek grammar. I wish to arrange them together as results of a common tendency. In most of them we shall find that a dental or a spirant is concerned, either as the active cause of the assimilation, the assimilating letter, or the sound assimilated. It is this tendency to assimilation which has produced the largest amount of change in Greek words; one consonant takes the place of another, even a consonant foreign to the original system is introduced. Yet it is noticeable how even here, in consonantal combinations, where the Greek seems to have changed so much more than the Latin, the Greek in reality has not lost so much; it has not lost any sound without some equivalent; whereas we saw that the Latin constantly allowed a consonant to drop without leaving any trace whatever. The Greek is also the gainer in softness of sound.

We may consider Greek assimilation under two main heads—as complete and incomplete. In the first case either one sound passes into the other, or the two pass into some third sound, denoted either by one symbol, as ζ , or by two, as $\sigma\sigma$, $\tau\tau$. In the second, one sound simply becomes more like the other. Under the first head we may distinguish the following cases.

I. Complete Assimilation.

(i) Where the first sound is assimilated to the second. Such cases are $\phi\alpha\epsilon\nu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ for $\phi\alpha\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\nu\omicron\text{-}\varsigma$, a form which is

(i) Assimilation of the first sound.

¹ Ahrens II. 18—84.

CH. VIII.

regular in the Aeolic¹, but occurs also in Tragedy. The Attic poets may possibly have borrowed this and similar forms from the Aeolic dialect. But they certainly could not have done so if the process had not been one familiar to the feeling of the Athenian language. It is shewn indeed in forms like *ἔννυμι* for *Ἔσ-νυμι*, which are universal throughout Hellas. Schleicher assigns to this principle the double *ρ* in *περίρρυντος*, *ἄρρηκτος*, &c. for *περισρυντος*, *α-ῤρηκ-τος*, which is not improbable². Cases like *συλ-λέγω*, *συρ-ρέω*, *ποσσί* for *ποδ-σι* (here the later Greek dropped one *σ*), are familiar to all. *ὄπ-μα* passed into *ὄμμα* in all Greek except Aeolic. But no doubt this result was much commonest in the Aeolic: in Lesbian, as *ἔμμι* for *έσμι*, *ἄμμες* (also Doric) for *ά-σμες*, *ἔμμα* for *Ἔσμα*; and in Boeotian *ἵττω* for *ἴστω* (as *Ar. Ach.* 911), *ἔττασαν* for *ἔστασαν*. I have already said that the Lesbian assimilates liquids and nasals chiefly; the Boeotian, dentals.

(ii) *Assimilation of the second sound.*

(ii) Where the second sound is assimilated to the first.

Here again the change is chiefly Aeolic. Thus we have in Lesbian *κτέννω*, *κρίννω*, *πέρροχος*, *κεννός* (for *κεννο-ς*), *Μίλλατος*³, *έβολλόμαν*⁴: we have *ὄππα*⁵ instead of *ὄμμα*, and *ὄσσομαι* for *ὄπ-τομαι*: see however the end of the next case⁶.

The forms *ἔσσομαι*, *ὄττις*, *ὄπποτα*⁷ are of course not Aeolic only (as far as the reduplication of the consonant goes), but also Ionic. I may add with respect to the last that the *ππ* is only found in pronominal words, in which the first *π* is not original: the old form of *ποτα* (whence *ὄ-ποτε*) was *κοτα*, then a parasitic *υ* sprang up after *κ*, and produced in turn *ὀ-κφοτα*, *ὀ-πφοτα*, and *ὀ-πποτα*. But I do not think that *ππ* is found in any case where *π* is radical⁸. The forms *ἔστελλα*, &c. for *έστελ-σα*, *τέσσαρες*

¹ *E.g.* Sappho, III. 2.

² *Comp.* 227.

³ Theok. xxviii. 21.

⁴ *Id.* i. 15.

⁵ Sappho, II. 11.

⁶ For more examples (all of the same kind) see Ahrens, *Gr. Dial.* i. 49—69.

⁷ Sappho, II. 2; III. 3.

⁸ Consequently we must reject the emendation *ὑπ' ἀππαλώ* in Theok.

for τετ^{τα}ρες, πολλός for πολ-^{φο}-ς (whence the other form πολύ(ο)ς), ὄλλυμι for ὀλνυμι, πίσσω for πτισ-γω, are of course Attic¹.

(iii) Where the two sounds pass into a third (doubled) sound.

Here we have the numerous and important cases where we find σσ (ττ) produced by the combination of γ with a mute. If we begin with the dentals where the nature of the change is most obvious, we find τγ passing into σσ (ττ) in κρέσσων for κρετ-γων (κράτ-ος, &c.), λίσσομαι for λιτ-γο-μαι (λιτ-ή, &c.), and similarly θγ becomes σσ (ττ) in κορύσσω for κορυθ-γω, in μέσσοις for μεθ-γο-ς. In all these and similar cases we find both the σσ and ττ forms. What is the history of these two forms? Which is the older of the two? Or is there some intermediate step through which they both come, but neither of them is derived from the other?

Pott holds ττ to be the oldest in the case of the verbs; where he thinks that το is the suffix, not γο. Thus he would make the order, πρακ-το-, πράττω, πράσσω, by regular weakenings. This however leaves the comparatives still unexplained. And further, the Doric, which elsewhere does not weaken τ to σ, has yet πράσσω, θάλασσα, &c.; so that these forms would be unexplained. The first appearance of ττ is in the Attic, and in Boeotian (which also shews δδ). In the *Tempora und Modi* Curtius seemed to explain the phenomenon as a Boeotism which had crept into Attica, in the first instance in order to avoid assimilation in words like σφάσσω, and then passed

CH. VIII.

(iii) *Modification of both sounds: where the first is a hard guttural or dental.*

xxvii. 4,

ὅππυι Κύπριδος Ἴρον καλᾶμω χλῶρον ἵππαπάλω†,
where the last word is corrupt. I like Ahrens' emendation καλᾶμω... ὑπασσάλω best of any that have been offered. Mr Snow however in his recent edition of Theokritus has carried out very ingeniously Meineke's suggestion, that some proper name has been lost in the MS. word, by producing from Strabo the name Ἀμπελος for a promontory of Samos. Still ὑπασσάλω is nearer to the MS., and so unusual a word was more likely to be corrupted than the common Ἀμπελος.

¹ Further examples are given by Schleicher, *Comp.* 228. Each one that I have given is typical of a considerable class.


over the whole language. This explanation, improbable on many grounds, he has since, I think, dropped.

Two other explanations seem to be possible. The first is that $\tau\tau$ was produced from τy , as $\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$: but that the y could also assibilate the τ (just as ι or $υ$ could, as we shall shortly see); and thus came also $\lambda\iota\sigma\text{-}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\text{-}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. This seems exceedingly natural and probable: we have the analogy of the English assibilation of ti , e.g. in *nation*, to help us, and to suggest that the $\sigma\sigma$ may have been sounded as sh ; which seems also more likely on physiological grounds, if we remember that the sound is a compromise between t and y : the change too in common use from $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ to $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$ would be less violent. But we are met again by the fact that the Dorians have the double σ , and yet do not exhibit $\sigma\iota$ for $\tau\iota$, the analogy on which this reasoning rests. Consequently we seem to be driven to the second explanation, to which Curtius and Schleicher incline¹; namely, that from the influence of the preceding dental, y weakened itself into the soft sibilant z . Thus $\lambda\iota\tau\text{-}\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ became $\lambda\iota\tau\text{-}z\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, and since this union of a hard and soft letter could not be permanent, $\lambda\iota\tau z\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ became either by case (ii) $\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, or by case (i) $\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$: where however it is possible that the t sound was still heard though not written: the combination ts would be a proper counterpart to the sound of ζ (to be mentioned below); and would also, still better than the sh suggested above, serve to bridge over the transition from $\sigma\sigma$ to $\tau\tau$ in Attic; particularly if we assume that the s after the t passed, as is natural physiologically, into sh : so that the whole scale should be, ty , tz , ts , tsh , tt . This second explanation applies to final $\nu\tau$, followed by y , as $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu\tau\text{-}\gamma\alpha$, whence $\chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$, $\pi\hat{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ for $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\text{-}\gamma\alpha$, &c. In favour of this view is the fact that the Boeotians in other cases hardened σ to τ , as $\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega$, &c. mentioned above. These words are not explained by the first hypothesis. It must however be

¹ See also Corssen, *Krit. Beitr.* 468.

borne in mind that it is not necessary that $\tau\gamma$ should have had the same history in the different dialects: it may have travelled by one road in the Attic, by the second in the Doric and Boeotian.

The two explanations will be best seen thus, side by side:



Next there are numerous words in which $\sigma\sigma$ ($\tau\tau$) arises from a guttural with γ as well as from a dental. Thus $\kappa\gamma$ becomes $\sigma\sigma$ in $\pi\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega$ ($\sqrt{\pi\tau\alpha\kappa}$), in $\eta\sigma\sigma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ (superlative $\eta\kappa\iota\sigma\tau\alpha$); there is a large list of such verbs and comparative adjectives, which does not need to be gone through: $\chi\gamma$ is also $\sigma\sigma$ in $\beta\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega$ (noun $\beta\eta\chi\text{-}\varsigma$) and $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ from $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$. In these no doubt the guttural was turned first of all into a dental by the γ ; which dental then in its turn assibilated the γ , just as it did above. The change from $\eta\kappa\text{-}\gamma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ to $\eta\tau\text{-}\gamma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ is just parallel to that which we shall have to notice in the Latin; by which e.g. *con-dic-io* passed into *conditio*, because there was no appreciable difference in the sound.

This result $\sigma\sigma$ ($\tau\tau$) seems to be confined to the combination of the *hard* gutturals and dentals with γ . This is worth observing, because in several cases it might seem as though the $\sigma\sigma$ was formed from $\gamma\gamma$ or $\delta\gamma$; e.g. $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\beta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, &c. But of these, the verbs are really derived from an older form, which contains the hard letter. Thus the $\sqrt{\pi\rho\alpha\kappa}$ seems to be guaranteed by the Lith. *perk-u* and the $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\chi$ λεγόμενον, *πρακός*¹. Similarly $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\upsilon$ is the root of $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi$ and $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\varsigma$, as well as the Lith. *plaku*, "I strike"². Lastly, $\beta\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ is probably the comparative

¹ Gr. Et. 624.

² Id. No. 367.

CH. VIII.

There is
no such
change of
a labial.

of βραχύς, not of βραδύς, to which it is commonly assigned¹. Other apparent exceptions admit of similar explanations.

I have said that σσ results only from κγ (χγ) or τγ (θγ). This statement is not disproved by the forms πέσσω, ἐνίσσω, and some others. The first, πέσσω, undoubtedly seems to be from πεπ in πέπων, &c. But an older form is πακ; and a still older (as far as regards the consonants) is found in the Latin √cōc. Similarly ἐνίσσω seems to belong to the Homeric ἐνιπή, ἡνίπαπε, &c.; yet the simpler form is √ik, found in Latin in the past participle *ic-tus*; so that ἐνιπή is a "word thrown," like ἱαμβος, where ἱάπ-τω is equally paralleled by the older Latin form *iac-io*. Similarly ὄσσα is not from Fεπ but the older √vak; and ὄσσε, "the eyes," is from √ok, found in the ὄκκος of Hesychius and the Latin *oculus*.

(iv) Where the two sounds coalesce into one single letter.

Change of
a soft
guttural
or dental.

This happens when γ is preceded by the *soft* momentary sounds, δ and γ. Thus δγ = ζ in ἔζομαι, from √sed, in ὕζω from √od, &c., in τράπεζα from (τε)τρα-πεδ-γα, in Ζεὺς from Δγεὺς (Sanskrit *Dydus*). These examples, with others, are given by Schleicher²: they are so numerous that any one may supply them for himself. They shew the origin of the Greek ζ, a compound letter, denoting first δγ, then δz. Hence the compound letter ζ or dz has the power of lengthening a previous vowel in prosody³, which power it could not have had if it had been only a weak sibilant=the French *z*. The objection to this view, that ζ was a double sound, namely, that the symbol would not have been likely to appear so early in the alphabet, is only valid against the old opinion that *z* represented *ds*: the Greek alphabet, undoubtedly, had symbols for both these sounds, and therefore did not require a single sym-

¹ *Id.* 622.

² *Comp.* 231, see *Gr. Et.* 562, &c.

³ Not however in Homer, where we find οἱ δὲ Ζάκυνθον ἐναίον, ἄστν Ζελεῖης, &c.

bol to denote them: but it had none for *z*. Where ζ is dialectically resolved into $\sigma\delta$ or $\delta\sigma$, it must be supposed that the σ was soft, just as *s* is so often in English. Some philologists believe that *z* was sounded not as δz , but as the English *j*, i. e. *dj*, as in *John*. There can be no question that this sound springs naturally in our mouths from the two sounds *dy*, the original parents of ζ : but this is not a conclusive argument for the Greek language: and looking on the whole history of *y* in Greece, I think the sound of *z* more probable. The representation of ζ by *ss* in old Latin seems also to favour the view that it was a clear sibilant in Greece. The statement of Dionysius that ζ was a double letter¹ seems strong against its having been merely the French *j*: but does not make clear whether it was *dz* or *dj* (English *j*).

Just as κy passed first into τy , so γy passed into δy , and then into ζ , as though the dental had been original. Thus $\sigma\tau\iota\gamma-\gamma\omega$ became $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, $\mu\epsilon\gamma-\gamma\omega\nu$ became $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omega\nu$ in Ionic, the Attic $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\zeta\omega\nu$, from the desire to compensate for the loss of the original spirant.

It has been already mentioned that in the Boeotian the *y* assimilates itself immediately to δ , and produces e. g. $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\delta\omega$ from $\phi\rho\alpha\delta-\gamma\omega$, not $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ ². At the beginning of a word one δ suffices, as $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ for $Z\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ ³.

We may now pass to incomplete assimilation—when the two sounds do not become identical, but only approximate to each other. The principle of course is the same as that which we have seen acting above; only it is not so fully carried out. In this class we have the following main heads:—

(i) The well-known cases in which the final hard letter of a root is changed to a soft one before a soft termination, as $\delta\acute{o}\gamma-\mu\alpha$ from $\sqrt{\delta\omicron\kappa}$, $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\eta\mu$ from $\sqrt{\gamma\rho\alpha\phi}$: and *vice versa* a soft passes into a hard, as $\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\lambda\epsilon\chi\theta\eta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, from

II. Incomplete Assimilation.

(i) "Euphonic" changes.

¹ See *New Crat.* p. 200.

² E. g. $\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\delta\delta\epsilon\nu$ for $\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\zeta\epsilon\nu$, *Ar. Ach.* 947. This is also Laconian. See *Lys.* 82, 94, &c.: *Ahrens* (ii. 96) gives some glosses from *Hesychius* to the same effect.

³ As in *Ach.* 911.

CH. VIII.

(ii)
Changes
caused by
nasals.

√λεγ. These have been already alluded to, and are too well known to need further description.

(ii) Momentary sounds are sometimes nasalised before nasals, as *σεμ-νός* from √σεβ: yet we have *ὑπ-νος* from √σφαπ¹. Before *μ* dentals have a strong tendency to pass into their spirant *σ*, as *πείσμα*, *ὄσμή*, *ἴσμεν*, and numberless others; yet we find *ὄδμή*² and *ἴδμεν* in Doric and old Ionic. A nasal could change the class of a momentary sound, in *δνόφος* for *γνόφος*, where the *γ* is probably itself weakened from *κ*; compare *κνέφας*. Similarly *ἀδνός* was Cretan for *ἀγνός*, whence the name *Ἀρι-άδνη*. That *γ* ever passed into *δ* without some assimilating influence is improbable. Therefore *οὐ Δᾶν*³ is probably = *οὐ Ζῆνα* (i.e. *Δ(γ)ᾶνα*) as Ahrens explains it⁴: and *Δημήτηρ* is either *Διφαμητηρ* or *Δγᾶνάματάρ*⁵; she is never called *Γημήτηρ*. In order that *γᾶ* should have passed into *δᾶ*, a parasitic *γ* must have sprung up after *γ*: which is improbable because it had *φ(υ)* after it, as shewn in *γύη*, i.e. *γυα-α*, and *αῖα* for *φαῖα* or *γαῖα*⁶.

(iii)
Changes of
nasals.

(iii) Nasals are affected in their turn by the following consonant: we have *συγ-καλέω*, and *ἀγγέλλω* (*ἀνά*); *ἐμπειρος* and *ἐμβαίνω*; and numerous others of the same sort.

(iv)
Change
of τ to σ.

(iv) In Ionic, Attic, and Lesbian, *τ* passes into *σ* before *ι*; as *φησί* for *φατί*. This might rather seem a case of simple substitution, and we find also *σήμερον* for *τήμερον* and a few others: but I believe that it first occurred in cases where a second vowel followed, as *πλούσιος* for *πλουτ-γο-ς*, *πλησίος* for *πλατ-γο-ς*: when the change would be due to the assibilating influence of the *γ*: then the softer sound was preferred universally; this *σ* for *τ* is also found before *υ* in *σύ*, but in Doric *τυ* is kept: the old form was *τυα*, where again the semivowel could assibilate; and

¹ *Comp.* 230.

² The line *τις ἀχῶ, τις ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής*; (Aesch. *Prom.* V. 115) cannot be however regarded as Attic.

³ Theok. iv. 17; vii. 39.

⁵ According to Max Müller, ii. 57.

⁴ *Gr. Dial.* ii. 80.

⁶ See page 120.

the same is probably true of the suffix *-συνη* for *-τυνη*, Latin *-tuna*; for there is a Vedic form *-tvana*¹. The Boeotian, like the Doric, preserves *τ* where the Lesbian and Attic have softened it into *σ*. I have already mentioned the peculiar Laconian weakening of *θ* to *σ*, which may have begun in the same way as the last change, according to my suggestion.

(v) The spirant *v* is altered by assimilation in certain dialects. Thus *Φρόδον* becomes *βρόδον* in Sappho², *Φράκος* is *βράκος*³; we find *βράδινος*, *βρίζα*, *βρήτωρ*, &c. This change is less surprising, for we have seen that *F* passed into *β* in Laconian even without any neighbouring sound to influence it⁴.

(v)
Changes
of τ.

In the word *σφε* we have a hardening of original *v* to *φ*. The old form is *sva*, which in Greek generally became *έ* (through *Fe*). In this case it is hard to believe that *φ* was much more than a spirant. The same change is seen in *σφώ*, the dual from *tva* (whence *sva* and *σύ*): compare the Latin *uo-s*, where the *t* has fallen off⁵.

(vi) Lastly come some very peculiar forms which seem to be more probably due to assimilation than any other cause. These are e. g. *πτόλις* by the side of *πόλις*, *πτόλεμος*, &c.⁶ It seems impossible to separate *πτόλις* from Sanskrit *pura* (also = a city) and Latin *ple-bs*, perhaps also *po-pul-us* (a reduplicated form); and therefore it must be from the root *PAR*, to fill, which in Greek appears generally as *πλα* or *πε*, in Latin as *ple*. This evidence excludes any possibility of *τ* having originally belonged to the root and then fallen out. It is clearly a Greek insertion. The only explanation of this curious change which I know, does not seem quite satisfactory. It is given by Professor Kuhn⁷ and adopted by Curtius: that *y* through

(vi) Other
exceptional
forms.

¹ *Comp.* 459.

² *Frag.* 69, 2.

³ *Theok.* xxviii. 11, see Ahrens, i. 34.

⁴ See p. 348.

⁵ *Gr. Et.* 549.

⁶ I formerly gave *κτείνω* by *καίνω* as another instance. But Sk. *kshan* points to an original *√ktan*: and Mr Fennell has shewn me that *καίνω* does not occur in Homer, so that it may be a later Greek weakening.

⁷ *Zeitsch.* xi. 310, see *Gr. Et.* 453.

CH. VIII.

indistinct articulation sprang up after π , and was assimilated by the π to τ . We have seen above that πy never became $\sigma\sigma$, as the other hards did; but it is not easy to see why, if the sound πy were difficult, it should not have passed into $\pi\epsilon$ or $\pi\iota$, instead of the very difficult $\pi\tau$. Possibly however a new parasitic δ may have sprung up before the y —the possibility of this will appear in the next chapter—and been afterwards assimilated by the preceding hard letter¹. This explanation is supported by the form $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$. Here again the dental seems to belong to the Greek only: the Sanskrit form is *hyas* for *ghyas*, Lat. *heri*: and here the Sanskrit gives the necessary y : $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, according to Curtius², is another case in point: the older form is preserved in $\chi\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, with which compare $\chi\theta\alpha\mu\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$; and the Latin *humus* agrees. Here however a different parasitic sound in Sanskrit has produced *kshamā* in that language.

Perhaps this explanation of these intrusive letters may stand till a better can be suggested. They are certainly not “euphonic” or “strengthened forms:” why did $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ require to be strengthened? Still less are they “metrical licenses:” why should a Greek poet have the liberty of arbitrarily inserting an entirely new letter in order to make a word suit his verse any more than an English writer?

3. General rules of Assimilation in Latin.

I. Complete Assimilation.

In Latin also we have complete and incomplete assimilation. Complete assimilation may be divided into the same heads as those which we considered in the Greek.

(i) Assimilation of the first letter.

(i) Where the first letter assimilated itself to the second.

¹ Ahrens in his *Griechische Formenlehre* extends this explanation to all verbs whose base ends in $\pi\tau\omicron$, e.g. $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$, $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$, $\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$; which, he thinks, arose from $\tau\upsilon\pi\text{-}y\omega$, $\mu\alpha\rho\pi\text{-}y\omega$, &c. It is certainly surprising that π is the last letter of the root of all verbs which have this formative suffix $\text{-}\tau\omicron$. But Ahrens' explanation can hardly stand when we see how the same suffix occurs in other languages, where we have no reason to suppose a parasitic y .

² *Gr. Et.* 454.

Thus *sup-mus* becomes *summus*, *sed-la* is *sella*; *d* is assimilated very frequently, as in *lapillus* for *lapid(u)lus*, *esse* for *ed-se*: *t* passes through *s* in *pet-na*, *pesna*, *penna*; compare *ces-na*, *cena*: *g* has been assimilated in *flamma* (*flagma*): very likely, as Schleicher suggests, *serra* is for *sec-ra*¹. In all these cases the radical vowel was short: therefore the final consonant was not absolutely forced out, but assimilated: and was written after the time when it became customary to write double consonants, not merely to make a little mark above one of them (the "Sicelicus"). When the vowel was long the consonant was entirely lost, e.g. in *suā(d)-uis*, and other cases already mentioned among examples of Loss. Sometimes the consonant was lost even when the vowel was short; it was, however, afterwards lengthened by compensation, as in *scāla* (*scad-la*), *squāma* (*skad-ma*), perhaps *finis* (*fid-nis*), *filum* (*fiq-lum*), &c.²

(ii) Where the second letter assimilates itself to the first.

This change happens to *t* in superlatives after *s* or *r*: as *durissimus* for *dur-i(o)s-tumus*, *celerrimus* perhaps (according to Curtius) for *celer-is-tu-mus*, *celerstumus*, *celer-simus*³; and numerous others⁴. After *r*, *s* naturally passes into *r*, as *ferrem* for *fer-sem*, *torreo* for *torseo*: and analogously after *l* passes into *l*, in *uellem* for *uel-sem*: *v* also assimilates itself to *l*, in *mollis* for *mol(d)uis* (Sanskrit *mṛidus*), *sollus* for *sol-uos* (seen in *soll-ers*, *soll-ennis*, *sollicitus*, *solli-fides*, &c.); compare the phonetically different *sal-uos*; the cause being doubtless the strong sound of *l* at the end of a syllable.

(iii) Where the two letters pass into another double sound.

This takes place with some past participles in *-tus* and

(ii) Assimilation of second letter.

(iii) Modification of both sounds.

¹ *Comp.* 258, whence these examples are taken.

² Corssen, i. 646.

³ *Comp.* 262.

⁴ Mr Roby however supposes (*Preface*, p. lxi.) that these superlatives are formed with the suffix *-umo*: and that the double *s* is erroneous, representing not assimilation but the strong sound of the *s*.

CH. VIII.

derivatives in *-tor*; where the *t* of the suffix together with the final letter of the root passes into *ss*. When the root itself ends in *s*, no such change commonly takes place, as *us-tus*, *haus-tus*, &c. But it occurs regularly when the root ends with a dental: e.g. *fissus* for *fid-tus*, *cassus* for *cad-tus*, *passus* for *pat-tus*, and many others: sometimes the first *s* vanishes, as in *ui-sus*, *lae-sus*, &c.: sometimes the double *s* is preserved in old Latin, as *ussus*, *diuis-sus*. In these cases Corssen gives the following explanation: the *s* at the end of the root is due to Dissimilation, as *equet-ter* becomes *eques-ter*: then *fistus* assimilated itself to *fissus*. Mr Roby argues against this view with great force¹. He points out that although the first step is quite possible, the second, which assumes the change of *st* into *ss*, is contrary to ordinary Latin usage, in which *st* is a perfectly stable combination. He therefore holds that the *t* of the suffix first changed into *s*—a change which is certain in *lap-sus*, *fixus* (*fic-sus*), *fal-sus*, &c., and highly probable in *pressus* (*prem-sus*), *passus*, (*pan-sus*), *iussus* (*iub-sus*), &c., where the root does not end in a dental, and where there is no need for dissimilation of the final consonant. In this way *fid-tus* becomes *fit-sus*, and then by regular assimilation (i) *fissus*. I think that this theory is very much preferable to Corssen's.

II. Incomplete assimilation.

(i) "Euphonic" changes.

Passing next to incomplete assimilation we find the first two cases as in Greek.

(i) The "euphonic changes," by which a hard passes into a soft before a soft; as in *segmentum* from $\sqrt{\text{sec}}$: and a soft into a hard, as *actor* from $\sqrt{\text{ag}}$.

(ii) Changes caused by nasals.

(ii) Momentary sounds passed into nasals, as *scam-num* for *scab-num*, *Samnium* for *Sab(i)nium*, *som-nus* for *sop-nus*², *amnis* for *ap-nis*. Dentals passed into *n* through *s*; as in *penna*, already mentioned. It cannot be proved that gutturals were sounded as *ng*, e.g. in *magnus*, *tignum*: but it is probable on the analogy of the other letters.

(iii) Change of *t* to *s*.

(iii) We saw just above that *fid-tus* passed into *fit-*

¹ pp. lvii.—lxi.

² *Comp.* 264.

sus, and then *fit-sus* into *fis-sus* by assimilation. To assimilation also would seem to be due the change of *t* in *-tus* and *-tor* when in contact with other final letters than *t* or *d*. These are chiefly *r* and *l*. The change however is only sporadic. The *t* maintains itself in *ar-tus*, *exper-tus*, and many others, but suffers change in *cur-sor* and *cur-sus*, *spar(g)-sus*, &c. Similarly in combination with final *l*, *t* still appears in *altus*, *cultus*, *ultus*, *sepultus*, &c.: but *s* appears in *falsus*, *celsus*, *pulsus*, *mul(g)sus*, *uol-sus*, and a few more. These cases may be explained as the result of imperfect assimilation. There was probably some vacillation in sounding the dentals, similar to that already noticed in Greek, which rendered corruption of them more easy. Assibilation of the dentals is not found in languages like the Sanskrit, where they are sounded with the tongue in a definite position against the edge of the upper teeth. But where the tongue is only pressed against an uncertain point of the front palate, the position for *t* and *d* becomes similar to that for *s*, and the change would be facilitated by a preceding *r* or *l*: by sounding *s* instead of *t* after *r* or *l*, the necessity of stemming the breath, which rushes forth in a continuous stream, is avoided. In the same way we may account for the change after nasals in *pressus*, *passus*, &c.; in which cases, as we saw above, the assimilation afterwards becomes complete: there is however no further change in *man-sum*. But this explanation will hardly suffice for the few cases where *s* is found, though the root ends with a momentary sound. Such are *lap-sus*, *lixus*, *fixus*, *fluxus*, and a few more. For these I think we must adopt Corssen's explanation¹: that the change began with those roots which ended in dentals: and that the new suffixes *-sus* and *-sor* came by degrees to be introduced through analogy into places where they were not helped by any assimilation. The tendency to soften *t* to *s* was an early one, as we see by the antiquity of the

¹ *Krit. Beitr.* 426.

CH. VIII.

Assibila-
tion of c
and t.

change from the older forms, *pul-tare*, *mertare*, *mantare*, &c., to *pulsare*, *mersare*, *mansum*, &c.¹

The assibilation of *c* and *t* in *ci* and *ti*, when followed by another vowel, is commonly assumed to have taken place in old Latin, as it undoubtedly did in the late Latin and the Italian. One part of the evidence for this change is the varying spelling even in good MSS. of words like *suspicio* and *suspitio*. The sound of the two must have been very similar before such a change could take place; probably much the same as in our "suspicion." The interchange would therefore be precisely analogous to that between $\sigma\sigma$ and $\tau\tau$, which we saw took place tolerably early in Greek. Corssen, however, who has gone most thoroughly into the question², proves that there is no such wavering of spelling in the inscriptions—our best guide—till a much later period than is commonly supposed. Thus, he says that there is no variety on the most trustworthy inscriptions down to the latest times of the Empire in the following words: *contio* (i. e. *co(n)uentio*), *nuntius* (probably *nouentius* formed, as Corssen suggests, from *nouere*, a nominal verb from *nouos*, on the analogy of *Florus*, *florere*, *Florentia*), *setius* (of uncertain origin, but with a by-form *sectius*, which may point, as Corssen thinks, to *seg-nis*), *otium* (uncertain), *indutiae* (for *indu-itiae*), *fetialis* (uncertain), *dicio* (i. e. *dic-yo*), *condicio* (which has nothing to do with *deditio* and other nouns formed from \sqrt{dha} , to place), *solacium* (uncertain), *patricius*, *tribunicius* (where the *c* is part of the suffix): both forms occur in proper names, like *Lartius* or *Larcius*, where a double derivation is quite possible: so that the complete confusion of the two spellings did not take place till the seventh century after Christ, though isolated instances doubtless occur much earlier. The best MSS. read *suspicio* and *suspitio*, *conuicium* and *convitium*; the first in each case is probably right etymologically. There is sufficient evidence of the assibilation of *ci* and *ti* among the provincials, which

¹ See Quint. i. 4. 14.

² i. 49—67.

Assibila-
tion of c,
late except
in the pro-
vincial
dialects.

gave rise to the confusion. *Ci* was sounded as *çi* and even *si* in Umbrian, e. g. *faciat* was *façia*, at least as early as the third century B. C.; the Umbrian had even a special symbol for this palatal sound: and *fasia* is Volscian. But for Latin there seems to be no evidence of the change of *ci*, any more than of the interchange of *ci* and *ti*, till the seventh century: while against the change there is the negative evidence of transliteration, e. g. *οὐκία* (in the sixth century after Christ), and the Gothic *faskja* and *laiktio* for *fascia* and *lectio*.

Mr Roby¹ has brought a good deal of additional evidence to bear on the point. Thus, he points out that the same word often varies its form so as to have different letters after *c*, or to have *c* final: e. g. *hice* and *hic*, *dice* and *dic*; was the *c* first palatal in the older and fuller forms, and then made guttural again in the ordinary form? So also in *decem* and *decumus*, *cano* and *cecini*, is it likely that the sound changed? or that it was different in *lacubus* and *lacibus*, forms which at one period were doubtless used indifferently. Again, Quintilian never hints that *c* had more than one sound, though he speaks in several places of the superabundance or the deficiency of the symbols of the Latin alphabet. Then with respect to transliteration, Mr Roby thinks if the *c* was assibilated, *σσ* would have represented the sound in Greek more closely than the *κ* which was actually used: it may doubtless be replied that the *κ* was used in order to represent the etymology, not the sound; and I think this argument would have force if the Latin had not itself abolished the corresponding symbol *k* from ordinary use: but *κ* does not even pictorially represent the Latin *c*; and therefore I see no reason for the Greeks having used it for this purpose, unless it gave the sound most nearly. Furthermore, if *c* had two sounds in Latin, it is surely strange that at some of the attempts to reform

¹ *Preface*, pp. xliii.—I. See also Prof. Munro in the *Academy* of March 5, 1871.

CH. VIII.

the Latin alphabet it was not suggested to employ again the symbol *k*, which was lying almost idle, to represent one of the two sounds: yet there is no mention of any such idea, though much more subtle distinctions of sound were more than once expressed by new symbols¹. To conclude, there can be no doubt that when *k* (or *c*) is followed by *e* or *i* there is a strong tendency to let the tongue slip upwards and so form a palatal instead of a guttural: and it is a fact that such change has taken place in modern Italian. But this change must have begun *at some time*; and there is no evidence for that time being nearly so far back as the classical period.

Assibilation of *t* a little earlier.

The change of *ti* to *si* seems to have been earlier and more general: but Corssen regards it as belonging especially to the vulgar Latin (and the other Italian dialects), and not established in the speech of educated Rome till the fourth or fifth century after Christ. It is traceable however in isolated cases much earlier. Such are e.g. *uiciens*, which has come regularly through *uicesiens* and *uicensiens* from *uicentiens*: similarly *amasius* and others with the termination *-asio* are most probably from old *-antio-*: *Acherunsius* is certainly from *Acherunt-io-s*, *Hortensius* was in old Latin *Hortentius*²: and numerous names of towns in *-esio* throughout Italy, as *Valesium*, *Falesii* (Latin *Falerii*), compared with others in *-ento*, as *Laurentum*, *Valentium*; and in *-usio*, as *Canusium*, *Brundusium* compared with *Acheruntium*, coincide with the other evidence for this change in all the Italian dialects, but seem to indicate that it occurred very slightly in Latin. I infer therefore that in classical Latin *ti* was sounded hard except in cases where another form in *si* actually occurs beside the latter.

IV. DISSIMILATION.

This principle has a more limited application to the consonants than even to the vowels, and for the same

¹ Roby, p. xliv.

² *Krit. Beitr.* 467, &c.

reason : there are not many cases in which the occurrence of the same sound twice is unpleasant to the ear. Still, few as they are, they are tolerably certain.

(i) One case where Dissimilation acts is common to Greek and Latin : namely, when a dental comes into contact with another dental at the beginning of a suffix. In this case the final dental of the root passes into *s*. In Greek the following examples may be given : ἀνυτ-τος becomes ἀνυστός : ἄδ-τεον becomes ἀστέον : πιθ-τος becomes πιστός. Similarly in Latin, *equit-ter(o)* passes into *equester* : *edti* becomes *est* : *claud-trum* is *claustrum*.

(ii) In Greek, when two aspirates occur too closely, one is softened : ἐ-θυ-θην becomes ἐτύθην ; θι-θημι passes into τίθημι. So also the suffix -θι of the imperative (Indo-European *dhi*), which is found e.g. in κλύθι, is changed to τ when another aspirate precedes, as σώθητι. Similarly if two aspirates occur in the root, one is dropped in conjugation ; for example the two forms τύφ-ω and θύπ-σω are referred to a root θυφ. The existence of these doubly aspirated roots has been maintained by Grassmann in his article already often referred to in the twelfth volume of the *Zeitschrift*¹. But where there is no other proof of the existence of the two than the double forms in Greek, it is much better in my opinion to assume only one for the root and then to account for the second (which never occurs in the same word as the first) by the principle of compensation.

To Dissimilation is also due the loss of the consonant in the reduplicated syllable of many verbs which begin with two consonants as ἔκτονα for κε-κτον-α, ἔγνωκα for γε-γνω-κα. It may be assumed also that the passage of a consonant into the rough breathing in the presents ἵσστημι, ἵημι is due partly to the desire for a dissimilar sound in following syllables. In ἐγείρω and some other words it is more likely that the *ε* is prosthetic (as will be pointed out in the next chapter) than that the word was

CH. VIII.

(i) *Change of a dental.*(ii) *Loss of aspiration in Greek :**and of initial reduplicated consonant.*¹ See also *Gr. Et.* 51.

CH. VIII.

originally γε-γείρω. Perhaps too the first consonant may have sometimes fallen away even in simple nouns for the same reason: as in ὄκνος for κοκ-νος, compared with Latin *cunc-tor* and Sanskrit $\sqrt{\text{cank}}$. But this must rest uncertain¹.

(iii) Latin
-aris and
-alis.

(iii) The only regular application of this principle in Latin—which is not equally sensitive with the Greek in this respect—is the curious change in the termination -aris or -alis, accordingly as *l* is found or *r* in the preceding syllable. Thus we have *uolg-aris*, *popul-aris*, &c.: but *mort-alis*, *later-alis*. Similarly the form *Pari-lia* sprang up beside the more difficult *Pali-lia*².

There are a few isolated cases of dissimilation in each language, which can be reduced to no rule. Such are $\phi\iota\text{-}\tau\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ ($\sqrt{\phi\upsilon}$) where the change to *ι* seems to be due to the following syllable; *ν* is found in the other derivatives: $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\omega$, as Curtius suggests, is another instance of conscious change. So also in Latin *ferbui* seems to owe its *b* to the difficulty of sounding the double *u*: *tenebrae* has been already mentioned as a possible instance³.

¹ See *Gr. Et.* 660.

² Corssen, i. 223; *Comp.* 267.

³ See p. 109.

CHAPTER IX.

INDISTINCT ARTICULATION.

I HAVE now described at some length the changes arising in Greek and Latin from a weak articulation. For example, we have seen how a stronger could be displaced by a weaker sound. This is the simplest instance of absolute weakening. Sometimes, again, we saw that a stronger took the place of a weaker sound, when that sound formed part of a compound which could be pronounced more easily after such change: here, therefore, also there was weakening; a violent contrast of sounds was done away with. In a word, the new sound or new compound was always an easier sound to pronounce under the circumstances.

I wish now briefly to consider a different kind of change, caused by what I call indistinct articulation. It is possible to alter a language in another way than by merely substituting an easier for a more difficult sound; in which case the new sound, weaker though it be, is clearly heard. It is possible to pronounce a word, generally through laziness, without sufficient sharpness to give each letter its full and proper sound. In this case no other recognised letter is at first heard; but an indefinite amount of indistinct sound is produced after the letter thus slurred; which in time, if this relaxed pronunciation become common, often takes the form of the nearest sound in the existing alphabet. Thus two letters grow out of one; and a word is often actually increased; and so it may happen that the new form is not really easier to pronounce than the old one. The old saying is here

CH. IX.

*Changes
produced
by want of
clearness
in pronun-
ciation.*

CH. IX.

justified, that lazy people give themselves most trouble. It is, I think, unquestionably the desire to save labour—to avoid the exertion required to pronounce clearly and distinctly a difficult sound—which produced this change, just as much as it produced substitution and assimilation, as we have already seen. Both kinds of change are due to that one and the same principle which causes all phonetic change: but as the sacrifice of clearness is much greater in this second kind, I see no real economy in it, and believe that laziness was generally its immediate cause¹.

I have given a few examples of this change from our own language in the first chapter². I now proceed to give some of its more remarkable operations in Greek and Latin. It affects most (as we should naturally expect) the strongest sounds—as the gutturals—or combination of sound, as e.g. *sum-sit*, causing the insertion of a non-original *p*; or, lastly, such sounds as were especially difficult to a particular people, as the spirants to the Greeks. I take first the passage of the gutturals in both Greek and Latin into the labials or the dentals.

1. *Labialism*.

Change of
K to π
and *p*.

This name has been given (first, so far as I know, by Professor Curtius) to the change from κ to π and *p*³. He believes the change to have been produced through the influence of a parasitic *u* or *w* (*v*): *k* is the hardest of all consonants, as he says, to pronounce, and requires the most distinct articulation to keep the sound pure from subsidiary breaths. If we pronounce it lazily without fully opening the mouth, the result is that together with it a slight *w*-sound is quite unconsciously pronounced, because the position of the tongue is almost exactly the

¹ See p. 5.² At p. 15.³ See *Gr. Et.* p. 45, &c.

same for *k* and *g* as for *w*, and if the lips be nearly shut an imperfect labial is necessarily produced: the *k* or *g* is followed by a labial after-sound; a "halbvocalischer labialer Nachklang," Corssen calls it¹: though the sound is a genuine consonant by the definition given at page 62; the mouth-aperture is so nearly closed that no sound can escape through it without rustling or friction; it has nothing of the pure vowel-sound of *u*. Other imperfect placing of the organs leads to other simple sounds, as *y*, whence arises Dentalism, which we shall next consider.

It is quite certain that *k* followed by a *w*-sound could pass into *p*: because we have examples of original *kv* retained in several languages, while *p* is found in one. Sometimes this *v* is part of a suffix in Indo-European; sometimes it is clearly phonetic only: therefore in cases where we find π in Greek corresponds to *k* (*c*) in Latin with no variation of meaning, we are justified in assuming that π has sprung from an original *k* through the help of a parasitic *v*.

As an example of original *kv* we may take the often-quoted *akva*, "a horse." Here the *va* is the termination: the noun is formed from $\alpha\kappa$, and the horse is conceived of as "the swift." The *v* is found in the Sanskrit *açva*, the Lithuanian *asvva*, the old Saxon *ehu*². By the side of these and the Latin *eq-uo-s* we cannot doubt that ἵππος stands for ἵκ-φο-ς ; especially as the assimilated form ἵκκος is preserved in the *Etym. Mag.*: the ι has sunk from the Graeco-Italian *e*. Here the original *kv* has passed into $\pi\pi$ in Greek. Rather oddly, the same original form must be assumed for the cognate words in many languages denoting water; Latin *aqua*, Gothic *ahva*, and Sanskrit *ap* or *âpas*, the nominative plural, which alone occurs in classical literature: the word does not seem to occur in any simple Greek form; but Curtius conjectures, with great probability, that it occurs in the name Μεσσ-άπ-ιοι ³, the dwellers between the two waters, on the analogy of *Μεσο-*

Possibility
of this
change.

¹ L. 76.

² Gr. Et. No. 624.

³ Gr. Et. 428.

CH. IX.

ποταμία, Μεθ-ἰδ-ριον, *Inter-amna*, &c. Next, the interrogative pronoun shews a secondary form—*kva* as well as *ka*—before the separation: whence come *qui*, the Gothic *hva*, the Sanskrit *ku-tas*, “whence,” &c., and, consequently, the Greek *πο* in *πό-θεν*, *ποῖος* (*πο-γος*), &c.: but that the simpler form *ka* still survived is shewn by its use in Sanskrit and Lithuanian, by the middle Ionic *κόθεν* and *κοῖος*, and by the fact that it was corrupted in a different way to Greek *τίς* and *τε*, which can come from *ka* but not from *kva*. Here there can be no doubt that the *v* conveys no difference of meaning: it is phonetic only, or, as we call it, parasitic. Again, the Latin *qui-es*, Gothic *hvi-la*, would seem also to shew a second form *kvi* by the side of *ki*, whence *κεῖμαι*¹: the Greek does not help us, as it never took the secondary form. Sanskrit and Lithuanian agree (at least initially) with the Greek in the forms *pañchan*, *penki*, and *πέμπε*: hence we should infer an Indo-European by-form *kvankan* beside the original *kankan*: the modification of the second *k* seems to be almost confined to Graeco-Italian. Sufficient examples have been given, I think, to shew that *kv* when original could pass into a labial; and Grassmann assumes in every case such a compound for the origin of the change². But these are nearly all the certain examples which can be given of the compound sound occurring in several Indo-European languages; and though useful as establishing the possibility of the transition, they are certainly by far too few to prove that the labial always results from an original Indo-European *kv*.

Next, we have to adduce examples where the *v* was produced in Graeco-Italian merely from phonetic causes, and was not a suffix. Such are the cases where *kv* (*qu*) is found in Latin as well as *k* (*c*), compared with the corresponding words in the Greek. Thus we have *sequ-or* by *sec-undus*, *coqu-o* by *coc-us*, *linqu-o* by *lic-et*³, *torqu-eo* by

*Caused by
parasitic v
in Graeco-
Italian.*

¹ *Krit. Beitr.* 50.

² *Gr. Et.* No. 625.

³ So also Leo Meyer, *i.* 29—31.

torc-ulum, and many others. And corresponding to all these we find π in Greek, as ἔπ-ομαι, πέπ-ων, ἔ-λιπ-ον, and τρέπ-ω. If we were left to the Latin we might have supposed that the *u* was added to strengthen the present stem; but this explanation will clearly not suit the Greek. We must conclude that the *v* is parasitic and belongs to the Graeco-Italian time; was retained by the Latin, and indeed often introduced into words which do not exhibit it in the Greek; but in Greek the *kv* regularly passed on to π , because the Greeks liked distinct pronunciation, and disliked "irrational" sounds, of which we saw so much in the Latin in an earlier chapter. That the Greek π is really the equivalent of Latin *qu* cannot be doubted even from the examples I have given: there are more in which neither language has kept the original *k*, as πέμπε (Aeolic) and *quinque*. Lastly we find sometimes in the Latin only the simple form in *c*, whilst the Greek shews the π ; such are *uoc-o* by ἔπ-ος, *oc-ulus* by ὄπ-τομαι; compare √σεπ in ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι, with √sec in Livius' translation of the first line of the *Odyssey*, "Virum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum¹: we have ὀπός, but the older form in *sucus*, ἵπος but *ico*, *ictus*, ἡπαρ but *iecur*. In all these we are justified in assuming that the Greek change is due to parasitic *w*, although we have no *qu* in Latin to help us. Sometimes indeed an original *w* may have repassed into *c* in Latin, as in *canis*, where the Greek κύων shews that *kvan* was the Graeco-Italian form. It seems difficult to believe that βουκόλος and αἰπόλος are not from the same root, i.e. √col: and αἰγι-κορ-εῖς, with Sanskrit *go-chara*, a cowherd, leads us back to original KAR or KAL: *upilio* and *opilio* shew a *p* again in Latin, or perhaps in provincial Italian². Curtius refers all these terms relating to pasturage to KAR, a root denoting regular motion, and, in a secondary sense, regular attendance upon the herds: the same root, he thinks, gives the agricultural terms

¹ Compare also Plant. *Miles G.* 1220; cum ipso pol sum secuta: which is altered by Fleckeisen to *locuta*.

² See Corssen, i. 426.

CH. IX.

Variation
in Italy.

colere, *colonus*, and Greek *πολεῖω*; the religious sense in *colere* and also in *θηπόλος*; and the habitual going to and fro of ordinary life in *πέλω*, *ἀμφίπολος*, *πωλέομαι*, *incola* and *inquilinus*. It will be observed in these how strong is the Greek tendency to the labial, and the Latin to preserve the guttural.

This change from *κ* to *π* cannot be called peculiar to any dialect in Greek; it is quite sporadic, occurring to some extent in all. But in Italy the line is pretty sharply drawn; whilst the Latin has only *qu* or the original *c* (*k*), the other Italian dialects often have only *p*. Thus *pid* is Oscan for *quid*; *pumpe* is Umbrian for *quomque*; "four" is *petora* in Oscan, *petur* in Umbrian; *pomtis* or *pompitis* is "five" in Oscan: and it is interesting to see the provincial names formed from these numerals, as Petronius and Petreius corresponding to the Latin Quartus, Pontius and Pompeius to Quintus: *petorritum* too seems to be simply a "four-wheeler". It is probable that Epona may be a Sabellian form of the horse-deity: also that *palumbes*, *popina*, are Sabellian in their origin, the Latin forms being *columba* and *coquina*; and I would suggest the same explanation of *saepes*, if it be the Italian equivalent of *σηκός*, and of *lupus*, compared with *λύκος* and Sanskrit *vṛika*; the wolf was not likely to be so formidable in the plain of Latium as in the central highlands, so that the Latin form may have fallen into disuse and been superseded by the Sabellian. Curtius² allows here an exception from his ordinary stringent rule, that both sound and sense must agree when we attempt to identify words in different languages. Schleicher with great consistency denies the connection, and betakes himself to the Zend *u-rup-is*³, and derives both from RUP (LUP), to cut, which seems to me an infinitely improbable conjunction. At all events *p* for *k* was extremely rare, if not wholly unknown,

¹ Mommsen, *Unterit. Dial.* p. 287—289.

² *Gr. Et.* 78.

³ To which *lupus* "wol one Zweifel gehört," (*Comp.* 241). Schleicher's mode of writing German corresponds to his subject; it is phonetic, and at first remarkably puzzling.

in Latin. *Discipulus* may be (as Leo Meyer suggests) for *disci-culus*: for *-culo-* is a common suffix and *-pulo-* almost unknown¹: if so, dissimilation is at least a helping cause.

The symbol Q, as already mentioned, is nothing but the Greek Q, and was received with the rest of the Doric alphabet from Cumae. So Quintilian speaks of Koppa as "similis effectu specieque, nisi quod paulum a nostris obliquatur²." In the same passage, however, it is spoken of as redundant; the reason is, that U was commonly written after it in Latin, to denote the labial after-sound; and therefore practically Q denoted no more than K. But there can be little doubt that Q was retained in the Latin list to denote the middle-sound, which was permanent in Latin, and therefore called for a symbol. In old Latin the U was omitted, at least when another u followed: thus we find *pegunia* in the Bantine Law³ and other inscriptions of the same age, *Mirqurios*⁴, *oquoltod* (i.e. *occulto*), &c.; and Corssen points out⁵ that this practice was even extended under the Empire, as shewn by these forms found on inscriptions, *qis*, *qaerella*, *neqidem*, &c.: but this probably was only a caprice of grammarians who wished to give the symbol some special use, and never became general. I have already mentioned⁶ that when o after qu passed in the regular course of weakening into u, qu was again written as c, in order to avoid the uu, as *cum*, *locuntur*, *ecus*, &c. When the Italians, who did not possess the symbol, borrowed a Latin word in which it occurred, they transliterated it by kv; thus *kvaisstur* is Oscan for *quaestor*: the Greeks denoted it by *kov* as *Κουρίνος*, by *κο* as *Κόιντος*, and *qui* by *κυ* as *Ταρκύνιος*⁷. The Latin grammarians seem to have perfectly understood the nature of the symbol QU, when they

History of
the Latin
Q.

¹ The instances given by Roby (*Grammar*, § 860) seem to be rather compounds than derivatives: e.g. *manipulus* is clearly from \sqrt{pul} (*ple*). For *simpulum*, see Corssen, II. 72.

² I. iv. 9.

³ Mommsen, *Corpus*, No. 197, p. 45.

⁴ *Ib.* No. 59.

⁵ I. 72.

⁶ See p. 310.

⁷ Corssen, I. 74.

CH. IX.

decided that the υ was neither a consonant nor a vowel: it was not a consonant, because in that case the e in *equites* must have been long; it was not a vowel, for that would have lengthened the second syllable by crasis with i . In other words, the υ was merely a symbol, expressing further and somewhat unnecessarily the indistinct after-sound which made κ different from χ . This sound, as I have said above, was liked by the Latins, and therefore they retained the koppa. The Greeks did not use the sound, and therefore soon dropped the symbol which they had taken from the Phoenician alphabet; it could never have been of use to them, for there is no trace of any period in Greek during which κ was passing into π : the transition would seem to have been immediate. It is this transitional sound which the Latin q represents; only the transition was never accomplished in Latium, though it was in the rest of Italy¹.

Change of
 G to β
and b .

Exactly analogous to the change from κ to π and p is that from G to β and b ; and here also we have the middle step denoted by the Latin *gu*. Here too the u is not parasitic in every case; thus in *pinguis* the u is a suffix, found in $\pi\alpha\chi\text{-}\upsilon\text{-}s$, and a new suffix has been added in the Latin; similarly in *brevius* for *bregh-u-is* ($\beta\rho\alpha\chi\text{-}\upsilon\text{-}s^2$). But it is parasitic in *tinguo*, the Greek $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\omega$, in *urguere*, where the language has presented the simpler form *urgere*, &c.³ Rather frequently the v has forced out the preceding g , and thus given rise to an apparent strengthening; in reality there is a loss. Such cases are *uiuere* for *guig-u-ere*; compare the old Norse *kvik*, our old English "quick," and Sanskrit *jîv*⁴; *bre(gh)uis*, &c. mentioned above; in these the v is original. In *fruor* for

¹ In the few Doric inscriptions where κ is found, it is generally followed by o , see Ahrens, II. 88, and *New Cratylus*, p. 190. This seems to be an attempt, similar to the Latin, to express the after-sound more clearly.

² Corssen, I. 85.

³ *Krit. Beitr.* 65, &c.

⁴ I think that Corssen is right in thus explaining the word (*Krit. Beitr.* 72), as opposed to Curtius, who treats the g itself as parasitic (*Gr. Et.* 547).

frugu-or (*frug-es*) both *g* and *v* have fallen out. The Latin words so far have no Greek equivalent which shews any corresponding change. But answering to *uor-are* for *guor-are* (Indo-European GAR) is Greek *βop-ά*, where the guttural has passed into the labial: (*g*)*uen-ire* is in Greek *βαίνειν* for *βav-yeiv*, and the original guttural is kept in Gothic *kviman*, our “come.” The Latin, on the other hand, shews no change in *gravis*, where the Greek has *βαρύς*: but the Sanskrit is *guru*, so the *u* may be original, or at least there may have been a by-form *guar*; and in the Greek itself we have the Boeotian *βavά* by the side of *γυνή*, shewing that the old form must have been *γvanā*, our “quean¹.” Curtius is probably justified in assuming an original *g*, where *β* is found in Greek, in the word *βαθύς* with which he compares the Sanskrit *√gádh* (doubtless originally *gádh*) = to dive into: in *βία*, compared with Sanskrit *√ji*, to conquer, and in *βίος*, compared with *jyá*, which may belong to this root: so also *√βαλ* may be Sanskrit (and original) *√gal*, found in German *quelle*, a fountain. Perhaps the only undoubted case in which both Greek and Latin have the labial is the certainly Graeco-Italian *bov-*, “a cow:” here all the other languages have the guttural; the Sanskrit is *gāus*, the German *kuh*. These examples are sufficient to shew that the *v* is less frequently a mere Graeco-Italian sound after *g* than after *k*, as might have been expected from *g* being a softer and easier sound: but it certainly was so in some cases; and, whether original or parasitic, it equally had the power in Greek of turning the guttural into a labial. The Italians seemed to have stopped at *gu*, as the Latins did at *kv* (*qu*).

The same cause may account for the rare change of the guttural aspirate in Greek. It becomes *φ* in *νίφ-ειν*, from the original root SNIGH². Perhaps also *ἐλαφ-ρός* may exhibit a weaker form of the base which we see in *ἐλαχύς*: the *v* is there, which in Latin *le(gh)u-is* has

Change of
GH to φ.

¹ See page 119.

² See page 143.

CH. IX.

been strong enough to eject the guttural altogether. I have already mentioned the not unfrequent change in Latin from *gh* to *f* in my account of the Latin Aspirates¹, and said that the same explanation is possible; it rests principally on analogy, there being no middle step preserved by the Latin, as in the case of the unaspirated gutturals. It is also possible that the change may be due to greater strength being given to the breath which is the second member of the compound: in this way the distinction between the initial momentary sounds would tend to become obscured: though this result was very rare in Greek, and not very common even in Latin. It is common enough, as has been already mentioned, in English at the end of a word, as *laugh*, but still more commonly the sound is lost altogether, as in *though* and (medial) in *light*, &c.

2. *Dentalism.*

Change of
K to τ.

This change from κ to τ is much less frequent in Greek. In Latin it does not seem to occur, except in the late transition of *-cio* into *-tio*, &c.², which is caused by the *i* being really a semi-vowel when another vowel follows; in these cases it is of course part of the suffix. So also was the *io* (*yo*) in Greek, which we saw produced so much change among the Greek verbs; as, for example, *πρᾶκ-yo* became *πρᾶτ-yo* and *πράττω*. These examples are quite enough to shew that *y* really has the power of turning a guttural into a dental: and justify us in assuming a parasitic *y* in cases where the change has happened in Greek without any suffix to explain it: especially when traces of the same action are discernible in the cognate languages. An undoubted middle step is given by the Sanskrit palatal *ch*, which is pronounced

¹ See p. 358. More examples (not all very certain) are to be found in Corssen, *Krit. Beitr.* 203—226.

² See p. 398.

half-way between the guttural and the dental, and was probably caused by an attempt to sound *k* without bringing the tongue far enough back, so that the organs are partly in the position for sounding *k*, partly in that which produces the palatal breath *y*, which therefore slips out involuntarily after the imperfect *k*, and the whole result is *ch* or, perhaps more commonly, *tsh*, where we pronounce the *t* very quickly. In the examples which I am about to give from the Greek, the *y* does not seem to have been very fully heard, though it had the power to change the *k* to τ and then fell out: so that the order of sound was κ , κy , τy , τ^1 . In the verbs and nouns mentioned under the head of Assimilation, where the *y* was part of the suffix, it left a permanent trace of itself in the doubling of the consonant. This difference of result in the cases where the *y* was radical, and where it was only parasitic, is, I think, no more than we should expect.

The certain examples in Greek are not very numerous, and have indeed been mostly mentioned before. Thus *τέσσαρες*, and Sanskrit *chatvāras*, are instances of Dentalism, though we saw that the Italian dialects gave us the labial in the same word. These numerals were of course peculiarly liable to corruption: they are almost the commonest currency of language: from their being necessarily used in barter, they are liable to foreign influence more than any other words: a fact which may be the key to the perplexing agreement of numerals in totally distinct languages, and to the strangely-altered forms of some of the Sanskrit numerals. This numeral, *katvar*, of the Indo-European had apparently two separate indistinctly pronounced forms before its separation, *kyatvar*, whence *τέσσαρες*, and *kvatvar*, whence *quattuor*: unless we rather believe that these weakenings took place after the ultimate separation, and so the agreement of *τέσσαρες* and *chatvāras* would be accidental: if this be so, as is on the

¹ See p. 15. If the Norse *fjord*, *fjeld*, &c. are examples of the same principle, it would appear that the *y*-sound can slip in, even after labials.

CH. IX.

whole probable, we must still assign to the Graeco-Italian the double form *katvar* and *kvatvar*: from the second we have the Latin *quattuor*, and an old Greek *πέρφαρες*, whence the Boeotian *πέρταρες* and the dubious *πέρυρες*, with which the Umbrian *petur* and Oscan *petora* also agree: the first form does not appear pure in either language; but the Greek alone dentalised the *κ*, and arrived through *τερφαρες* at the Attic *τέρταρες* or *τέσσαρες* and the Doric *τέρορες*, where the *α* has been dropped and the *F* vocalised: the Latin shews no *t*. Just the same variety of the Greek and Latin forms is seen in *τίς* and *quis*, where the Sanskrit has the original *k* in *kis*; parallel however to *τε* and *que*, which are probably from the same base, the Sanskrit has *cha*, corresponding again to the Greek. Lastly, *τίω* corresponds generally to Sanskrit *√chi*, so that here also we have probably an instance of dentalism: no Latin word can be connected with these: for that *timeo*¹ belongs to the same family seems unlikely both from its meaning and from the *t*, for there is no evidence of the *t* occurring for *κ* in Latin: both *τίω* and *chi* have many meanings, but the radical idea seems to be to "search," and then "tell over," "count;" and so in Greek "to estimate," "honour;" in Sanskrit to "collect." These forms are all which are given by Curtius as certain²: and he observes that in all of them the original *k* was followed by either *ι* or the cognate *ε*; a fact which would very much assist the slipping-in of the parasitic sound. If *ποίνη* belongs (as seems not impossible) to this same root *κί*, then the root has been labialised as well as dentalised in Greece.

Change of
G to δ.

The change from *G* to *δ* is exceedingly rare and uncertain, occurring mostly in isolated dialectical forms. Curtius, however, explains, though somewhat doubtfully, by this process the verb *ζάω*, as being for *διάω* by the regular process of Greek assimilation³. This *δ* he would connect with *GI*, the simpler form of the old root which appears lengthened, but also dentalised in Sanskrit, as *√jiv*, and

¹ Benfey, *Sk. Lex.* s.v. *chi*.

² *Gr. Et.* 442, &c.

³ See p. 390.

probably labialised in Greek, as $\sqrt{\beta\iota}\text{F}$ in $\beta\iota(\text{F})\text{os}$, &c. If it seem odd that the same root should have been both labialised and dentalised in Greek, so as to produce the dissimilar forms $\beta\iota\acute{\omega}$ and $\zeta\acute{\alpha}\omega$, this is no more than certainly took place in the interrogative pronoun: from which come the two Greek derivatives $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and $\pi\acute{o}\iota\omicron\varsigma$. The probability of the derivation is increased by the form $\delta\acute{\iota}\text{-}\alpha\iota\tau\alpha$, where the $\delta\iota$, perhaps through the influence of the following diphthong, has not been affected. Some cases where γ passed into δ by assimilation have been already mentioned. The excessively rare change of GH to θ has been already accounted for on a different principle to that which we are now considering.

There are in Latin one or two well-known examples of the transition from D to b. These are *bis*, the older form *duis* (which is also the Sanskrit form) being given by Festus¹: here the *u* is part of the root, and is seen in *duo*, *duplex*, *du-bius*, &c. Again, the old form of *bellum* is *duellum* "division:" *duellatores* occurs even in Plautus²: and *bonus* was originally *duonus*, already quoted as occurring on the epitaph of Scipio. Here the *u* may have been either radical or parasitic; the derivation is uncertain. Corssen (*l. c.*) thinks that it was "irrational" for all, which seems very improbable. But there can be no doubt that in all the *w*-sound assimilated the *d* to *b*, and then passed out, or combined with it, as Corssen prefers to explain it. I know no certain examples in Greek where δ standing alone passes into β : Curtius mentions some very dubious ones³. The cases where δ becomes β through assimilation are rare, but quite different to the others.

Change of
D to b.

3. Parasitic d before y or i.

This peculiar change has been for the first time thoroughly investigated by Curtius⁴. I think that some

¹ Corssen, i. 125.

³ *Gr. Et.* 440.

² *Capt.* 68.

⁴ *Ib.* 569, &c.

CH. IX.

The ap-
parent
change of
Y into ζ.

of his conclusions are doubtful, and particular points have been assailed by different critics. Of the main principle however I think there can be no doubt, though it may be wrongly applied in special cases. I will give the main results to which Curtius comes and the commoner examples: those who wish to see the further evidence supplied by uncommon forms and glosses must find it in his own pages

We saw that δy could frequently change into ζ in verbs, where δ was the termination of the root, and y the initial letter of the suffix: y passed into the weak dental spirant z , by assimilation, and thus for δy we had dz , that is, ζ . So $\phi\rho\alpha\delta-y\omega$ became $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$: and there are numerous examples of nouns where the same change took place. Thus Ζεύς was for $\Delta y\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, from DIV or DYU: $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ became $\zeta\acute{\alpha}$ in the Lesbian dialect¹: Ζάκυνθος may be δι-ακανθο- , "the thorny island", on the analogy of διανθής , Διακρία , &c.²: and the same form ζa is found as an intensive ("through and through," "thoroughly") commonly in Greek, as $\zeta\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\zeta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, &c. Again, πεζός is πεδ-ιος : ἀρίζηλος is ἀρι-δyηλος , perhaps, as Curtius suggests, for ἀρι-διF-ηλος ; ρίζα is Fριδ-γα , &c. In all these examples the δ is radical, and the ζ therefore to be expected. But how are we to explain forms like e.g. ζυγόν ? This is from YUG, and all the cognate languages give us y or its regular substitute. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that this ζ is another variation from original y , another attempt to avoid the disagreeable sound which resulted in a weak δ being heard before it: ζ therefore, that is, δy , is not a substitute for y , but the combination of y with another involuntary sound. Here the fact is undoubted, and the explanation seems to me the best pos-

¹ So $\zeta\acute{\alpha}$ τὰν σὺν ἰδέαν, Theok. xxix. 6: see Ahrens, i. 45.

² We might compare "Thorn-ey" near Ely, but perhaps Thorn is here the proper name which occurs so often in the North of England, e.g. in Thorn-by, Thorn-thwaite.

³ Gr. Et. 564.

sible. The δy , according to Curtius, passed into different forms, which I will give in order.

(i) δy appears as ζ : in $\zeta y \acute{o} \nu$, in $\zeta \epsilon \acute{\alpha}$ or $\zeta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}$, the Sanskrit *yava*, in $\zeta \eta \mu \acute{\iota} \alpha$ from $\Upsilon \alpha \mu$, which occurs in Sanskrit in the general sense of "restraint:" a regular substitution from the same root gives us $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho \acute{o} \varsigma$, and it is not impossible that $\eta \nu \acute{\iota} \alpha$ may be from the same root by the change of μ to ν , though there seems no special reason for it here. Again, we have δy as ζ in $\zeta \omega \mu \acute{o} \varsigma$ and $\zeta \upsilon \mu \acute{\eta}$, compared with Sanskrit *yásha* and Latin *ius*. In none of these is there radical δ ; which therefore must be supposed to be produced involuntarily. The connection of $\zeta \acute{\epsilon} \omega$ ($\sqrt{\zeta \epsilon \varsigma}$) with Sanskrit \sqrt{yas} (=to struggle) seems to me uncertain from the absence of any trace in that language of the simple meaning found in $\zeta \epsilon \varsigma$. So also $\zeta \eta \tau \acute{\epsilon} \omega$, which is commonly connected with Sanskrit \sqrt{yat} (to exert oneself), is better referred by Curtius and W. Christ to a secondary $\sqrt{y \acute{a} t}$ from $y \acute{a}$, because of the length of the vowel: but in either case the ζ is the result of δy . Next Curtius explains in this way with great probability the double verb-forms in $\alpha \zeta \omega$ and $\alpha \omega$, &c. I have already often mentioned that $\alpha \omega$ is a modification of original $\alpha y \alpha$ or $\alpha y \acute{o}$, the y having fallen out: but it is quite possible that before it fell out it may have engendered a preceding δ from the neglect of clear pronunciation: thus $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota - \alpha y \acute{o} - \mu \iota$ would become $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota - \alpha y \omega$, and on one side $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota - \acute{\alpha} \omega$, on the other $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota - \alpha \delta y \omega$ or $\acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega$. This etymology seems to me peculiarly ingenious, and will explain all cases where the double form occurs: though in some of course it is possible that the δ may be radical, as $\lambda \iota \theta \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ from $\lambda \iota \theta \alpha \delta$ -. It also explains the numerous verbs in $\iota \zeta \omega$; thus $\acute{\iota} \beta \rho \acute{\iota} \zeta \omega$ is $\acute{\iota} \beta \rho \iota \delta y \omega$ from $\acute{\iota} \beta \rho \iota - y \acute{o} - \mu \iota$: though in a few of these also the δ belongs to the base, as in $\epsilon \lambda \pi \acute{\iota} \zeta \omega$ from $\epsilon \lambda \pi \iota \delta$ -.

(ii) δy takes the form of $\delta \iota$. This is principally in the termination $-\delta \iota \acute{o}$ -, which is not of very common occurrence; it appears in $\rho \eta \iota - \delta \iota \acute{o} \varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha} \iota - \delta \iota \acute{o} \varsigma$ from $\rho \acute{\epsilon} \iota \acute{\alpha}$ and $\acute{\alpha} \epsilon \acute{\iota}$ respectively; in both the combination of vowels would

*Y with
parasitic
 δ appears
(i) as ζ ;*

(ii) as $\delta \iota$;

CH. IX.

be difficult to sound, before the termination *yo* or *io*, and hence, according to Curtius, the parasitic δ arose between them: wherever *-dios* occurs it is always preceded by a vowel. It forms adjectives from some roots under the like condition, as *σχέδιος*, *ἀμ-φά-διος*, *στά-διος*, &c.¹ Curtius combines with these the form *ἴδιος*, as the possessive pronoun of the third person for *σφέ-διος*, through *ἑιδιος*: the weakening of the ϵ to ι might be explained by assimilation, as in *σφίσι* for *σφε-σι*. This derivation is very probable: but the δ might be part of the root which probably ended in *d* in Graeco-Italian, if we may judge from *med* and *ted*, which are accusatives as well as ablatives in Plautus²: also the Sanskrit adjectives are *mad-īya* and *twad-īya*: and so Bopp explains it. Benfey regards all the terminations in *-dio* as weakened from original *-tyo*.

(iii) as $\delta\epsilon$;

(iii) *dy* appears as $\delta\epsilon$. This is limited again to a few nouns in *-deos*, as *ἀδελφί-δεος*. Certainly here at least the δ does not belong to the base: though here also we might assume an original suffix *tyo*.

(iv) as δ .

(iv) *dy* loses the original *y* and only the parasitic δ is left. This is more certain than the last two cases, at least in dialectical forms, as the Boeotian *δυγόν* for *ζυγόν*, *ιεράδδω* for *ιερ-αδγω* or *ιερ-αγω*. The occurrence of *δυγόν* beside *ζυγόν* and the Latin *iug-um* seems to me to make the evidence for the theory complete in that case. From YAM (mentioned on the last page) we probably have *δάμνημι* in Greek as well as *ζημία*. This involuntary δ is further assumed by Curtius in several dubious words. Such are the particle *δή* which he explains as originally (*dyā*, from the pronominal base *ya*, so that the meaning would tally with that of the German "ja," our "yea:" ἤδη, as he thinks, stands to *δή* as ἦ μὲν to μὲν. Corssen³ connects *δή* and *δήν*, and also the Latin suffixes *-dum*, *-dem*, *-do*, &c. with the base *div* "a day," I think less probably: though *diu* is certainly from that base and

¹ Gr. Et. 578.² E.g. Aul. 120.³ Krit. Beitr. 500.

means originally "all day." In such forms as these the derivation must be always uncertain; there is no necessary correspondence as to meaning to guide us, and the words, being common, have probably suffered so much from use that their original form also must be guessed at. Curtius explains in the same way the rather numerous adverbs in *-δον*, *-δην* or *-δα*¹, which he regards as originally cases from adjectives in *γα*, with parasitic *δ*, like those which end in *-διος* or *-δεος*, except that here all trace of the *γ* is lost. Thus we have *σχεδόν* by *σχεδίνη*²: *κατωμα-δόν* by *κατωμά-διος*: and the variation between *ἄδην* (or *ἄδην*) and *ἄδδην* would be explained by an original form *σα-(δ)γην*, where the *γ* either fell out without trace, leaving the preceding vowel short, or after lengthening it³, or finally was assimilated to the *δ*, as in *ιερᾶδδω* (see last page). Similarly the suffixes *-δε* and *-ζε* would be explained as modifications of *(δ)γε* from the pronominal root *γα*. The verbal suffix *γα*, added to *√μερ*, gives as the regular form *ἀμείρω* (the *α* is prosthetic); but there is the parallel form *ἀμέρδω* in Pindar, where the *δ* seems due to the original *γ*: in this, however, and some other similar cases it is possible that there may have been a secondary root ending in *δ*. Since *ὀπαδός* can hardly be separated from *ὀπάων* and *ὀπάζω*, it seems better to suppose that the nominal suffix *γα* engendered the *δ*, rather than refer it to *√pad*, whence come *πεζός* and *πε(δ)s*; though this

¹ *Gr. Et.* 592.² *Il.* v. 830.

³ This, without doubt, is the explanation of *κᾶλός* and *κᾶλός*, *ἴσος* and *ἴσος*. These double forms were produced side by side in a transitional period; each survived in the language, and therefore there is nothing strange in our finding both even in the same line (as Theok. vi. 19; viii. 19). Similar variations in Latin are not so easy to explain: a great list is given by Lachmann (on Lucr. i. 360) but with no explanation: see also Munro on Lucr. iv. 1259. In the common cases such as *nīger*, *nīg(e)ri*, no doubt, even after the *e* was omitted in writing, enough of its sound was retained in the *r*, to allow the root-vowel to be pronounced short or long. In *pūsus*, *pūsillus*, &c. the cause is the stress on the second syllable. Lastly where the same word occurs both long and short, e.g. *cōturnix* and *cōturnix*, *uiētus* and *uiētus*, &c., I think that in nine cases out of ten the change is from long to short: so that the new form would represent that regular weakening of the ordinary Latin of which I have said so much. But there are other cases which cannot be so explained.

CH. IX.

would suit the sense well enough. Lastly, the same involuntary δ , which has expelled its parent y , is assumed by Curtius to explain patronymics in $-\delta a$, names of beasts in $-\delta \epsilon \nu$, nominal bases in $-\alpha \delta$ -, and $-\iota \delta$ -: that in these last the δ was no essential part of the suffix is proved, he thinks, by the double forms, e.g. $\mu \eta \nu$ - ι - σ and $\mu \eta \nu$ - $\iota \delta$ - σ , $\sigma \phi \rho \acute{\alpha} \gamma \iota \nu$ and $\sigma \phi \rho \alpha \gamma \acute{\iota} \delta \alpha$, &c.: he believes the suffix ι to have been originally long; it then necessarily parted into ϵy before case-suffixes beginning with a vowel, as is regularly the case in Sanskrit (e.g. $b h \acute{t}$, $b h \acute{t} y$ - $a s$); and so, as elsewhere, a δ sprang up before this y .

Estimate
of the pro-
bability
of these
changes.

These are the principal cases in which Curtius assumes his parasitic δ . Corssen controverts some of his results¹, not, I think, on very strong grounds: first, because such a δ could not have arisen after a consonant, e.g. in $\gamma \rho \acute{\alpha} \beta$ - $\delta \eta \nu$, $\phi \acute{\upsilon} \rho \delta \eta \nu$, &c.; I am not sure of this; besides, such words might be formed on the analogy of others; there can be no doubt that $\delta \eta \nu$ (whatever its origin) established itself as an independent suffix: secondly, because the forms in $-\delta \iota \eta \nu$ may be formed from $\delta \sigma$ with the secondary suffix $\iota \sigma$: thirdly (and this is the strongest argument), that these Greek formations cannot be separated from the Latin adjectives in $-\delta o$: and that forms like $\epsilon \lambda \pi \acute{\iota}(\delta)$ - ς , $\phi \upsilon \gamma \acute{\alpha}(\delta)$ - ς are parallel to *lau(d)-s*, *here(d)-s*, &c.; Κρονίδης to *Alf-id-iu-s* (beside *Alfius*). It is quite true that there is no trace of the generation of d before y in all classical Latin; but, if these formations be really identical, and not (as seems to me quite possible) the result of independent processes in the two languages, it cannot be said to be impossible that such a principle may have been in operation in Graeco-Italian, and afterwards checked altogether in Italian. We have seen that a certain weakness of the d -sound belongs to the Latin as much as to the Greek: and such a weakness leads to the wrongful insertion of a sound in some places, as well as to its omission in others.

The strongest argument for Curtius' view is well stated

by Schleicher¹: "In the stem-formations of the Indo-Germanic, *y* is an extraordinarily common, *d* is a rare element, so that there is hardly another possible way of bringing these Greek formations into harmony with those of the kindred languages." This consideration must at least prevent us from regarding the assumption as merely arbitrary: and it is much more improbable that in every case δ should be weakened from τ , a weakening for which the Greek shews no special liking. The argument brought against the theory, that it is improbable that one and the same sound should appear in so many different forms, is answered, I think, with great force by Curtius. He says²: "The less we regard as probable an isolated deviation with no apparent reason from the path of regular substitution in the case of those sounds which remain to all time in common use in a language, so much the more decisively may we allow sporadic variation for those sounds in it which we perceive to be from the very beginning vanishing out of it." Such a sound is especially *y* in Greek: in the earliest records of the language we find only the imperfect substitutes for it; and it is certainly not improbable that at a yet earlier period, when it was still heard, the imperfect attempts to pronounce it may have produced by its side a letter which is itself indistinctly sounded in Greek, and so in process of time, out of these two indistinct sounds, one distinct sound may have arisen. At all events, as Schleicher prudently sums up, "what every one allows in some cases ($\zeta\upsilon\gamma\acute{o}\nu$, $\delta\upsilon\gamma\acute{o}\nu$, and $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ for *ghyas*) is also possible in others³."

¹ *Comp.* 216.

² *Gr. Et.* 580.

³ The instances of the same process in modern languages are well known: e.g. Ital. *diacere* for *iacere*, &c.; see Curtius, p. 569, note; Ferrar, p. 85. The *d* heard before an English *j*, e.g. in *John*, is nearly parallel; and supplies the strongest argument for supposing that ζ had that sound. See page 391.

Parasitic
y after ζ.

4. Parasitic y.

This is principally found after δ, and therefore produces the same results as parasitic δ before original y; but they are much fewer, for y, a sound difficult to a Greek, was not very likely to spring up involuntarily, and clearly could only do so in that early prehistoric time when y had not yet vanished out of the language; so the traces of it are few. It seems to occur in ζορκάς¹, the dialectical form of δορκάς, where the δ is original; and, rather oddly, in the same word the y seems to have expelled the δ and then vocalised itself, for we have the third form ὕορκ-ες (nom. plur.) in Hesychius². On the strength of a gloss in Hesychius, δείκηλα, εἰκόνες, and the form δέικελον, which occurs³ in this sense, Curtius believes that the original form of the common √ικ, whence εἰκών, ἔοικα, ἵκελος, &c., was δικ, which produced a parasitic y and then vanished; so that οὐδὲ ἔοικεν in Homer should be scanned οὐδὲ γέγοικεν, not Féφοικεν: this I think is very probable, for there is nothing in the cognate languages to justify a digamma in the word. That δ can fall out before ι (y) seems clear from the well-attested ἰωκή (√διωκ), where, as Curtius has pointed out, the ι is certainly radical: this loss is only a further extension of the corruption of the dentals which turned διά into ζα. It is not necessary however to assume that ἰαίνω is for διαίνω⁴. Lastly, as δy, where the y was radical, was sometimes assimilated to δδ, so here also we may explain the peculiarities connected with √δι, "to fear." Thus ἔδδεισεν is frequent in Homer, and frequent too is the lengthening of a previous short syllable, as μέγα τε δεινόν τε⁵, and οὔτε τί με δέος ἴσχει⁶. These become quite intelligible on the supposition that y was produced

¹ Herod. iv. 194.

² Anth. Pal. v. 260.

³ Il. xii. 10.

⁴ Gr. Et. 607, &c.

⁵ As Geldart does, p. 32.

⁶ Il. v. 817; Gr. Et. 607.

involuntarily after δ , so that $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ was $\delta\gamma\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$: and so we need not suppose that $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ is a merely mistaken formation, like $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon$, &c.¹: the fact that this apparent metrical license is not confined to the verb, but is found also with the nouns, speaks strongly for some real sound being heard after the δ ². Further examples (not perhaps equally certain) may be found in Curtius³.

5. *Aspirating unaspirated letters.*

This takes place to some extent in Greek. The new *h* is clearly parasitic, when it is initial; when it occurs in the middle of a word (almost exclusively after hard sounds) it might be regarded as merely a case of substitution; for the aspirate, as has been already said, is a weaker sound than the unaspirated letter: it arises from the stoppage being so short that a portion of the breath has not been appreciably checked; and so it makes itself heard after the check is removed. But I have preferred to treat of the whole subject together: though some of these cases have been mentioned incidentally in the account of the Greek aspirates, the theory of their origin is considerably confirmed by the occurrence of this involuntary aspiration. A similar phenomenon is found in Sanskrit; and it may sometimes happen that the same word has been aspirated in the two languages. But there can be little doubt that such coincidences are accidental, and that each language pursued its own course separately in this respect. The aspirates thus found in Sanskrit corresponding to the Greek are always hard ones.

The commonest cause of this parasitic *h* is the influence of an adjoining liquid or nasal, or a preceding σ ⁴.

Involuntary aspiration of hard letters; found in Sanskrit and in Greek.

¹ See Curtius, *Erl.* p. 46; and above, p. 368.

² Benfey however (*G. W.* II. 224) supposes the root to be $\nu\alpha\iota$ connected with $\delta\nu\omicron$, whence Sanskrit \sqrt{dwish} , to hate.

³ *Gr. Et.* 604, &c.

⁴ *Gr. Et.* 456.

CH. IX.

Thus we find *φροῦδος* from *πρό, ἐπίβα-θρον* instead of the common suffix *-τρον*, with *κλείθρον, λύθρον*, and some others: the fact that we have sometimes *τρον* and sometimes *θρον*, with no apparent reason for the difference, shews how thoroughly sporadic the change is. We have *τέφ-ρα* from *√τερ*, whence Latin *ter-eo*; the Sanskrit keeps original *a* in *tap-as*: *λύχ-νος* from *λυκ-*, *ἐξαίφνης* from *ἐξαπίνης*, where the nasal is the cause; so also *ἔγχος*, (where the nasal seems to be intensive, as the root is probably *AK*), *αἰχμή* from the same root, *τέχνη* from *√τακ*, *ρύγχος* but *ρέγκω*, *ὀμφ-ή* from *√φεπ*; and several others given by Curtius (*l. c.*). The spirant has acted in *σχίζα* from *√skid*, Latin *scindo*; in *σχεδία*; probably in *σθέ-νω*, if this be a strengthened form of *STA*, which in Sanskrit becomes *√sthā*; in *σχελίς* by *σκελίς* and *σκέλος*, *σφυρίς* by *σπυρίς*, in *σφεδανός*, *σφοδρός*, *σφενδόνη* and *σφαδάζω* from original *SPAD*; and many others. The form *σφαλ* has been already discussed at length.

In other cases it is not easy to assign any further cause than mere laziness; which operated of course irregularly, but yet affected some words permanently. Such are *βλέφ-αρον*, *σοφός*, and *σαφ-ής*: the two latter are from *√sap*, in Latin *sapio*, &c. Curtius rejects Benfey's explanation that the *h* may be caused here by a *v*; that *βλέφαρον* is for *βλεπ-φαρο-*, for *-vara* is at least a Sanskrit suffix; and *σοφός* is similarly for *σοπ-φο-ς*: it seems to me not improbable, at least for the first two, and *σαφής* may have been formed on the analogy of *σοφός*. I know of no reason for the certain change of *√δεκ* into *δέχ-ομαι*, *√τυκ* into *τεύχω*, of *√πτυκ* (from original *√πυκ*) in *πτύσσω* into *πτυχή*. The change of the labial is much more common; thus *ἄφ-ενος* is the Sanskrit *ap-nas*, which is Vedic, but occurs in *apnas-vant*, "efficacious¹," and the Latin *op-s*, &c.; contrast *in-ops* with *apnas-vant*; *κορία* is *co-oria*². From *√λιπ* comes *ἀ-λειφω*, from *√σκαπ* *σκάφος*,

¹ Benfey, *Lex.* s.v.

Gr. Et. No. 653.

and *τρέφω* may be only a secondary form of *τρέπω*: further examples may again be found in Curtius.

There is no certain example of this *h* being produced after a soft explosive sound. Several possible ones are discussed by Curtius¹. But for all of them I think other explanations are possible. Thus *ῥαχία* certainly need not be connected with *√Fpay* (*ῥήγνυμι*), it being quite possible, as Curtius suggests, to class it with *ῥήσσω* (*ἀράσσω*), which imply a *κ*, or even with Hesychius' gloss *βράκλαι οἱ τραχεῖς τόποι*. Curtius seems to allow the change in *παχύς*, which he combines with *πήγνυμι*, *πηγός*, *πάγος*, &c. But here also we have seen that the older form of the root is *πακ*²: so that *παχύς*, *πάχ-νη*, &c. may be formed by aspiration directly from this original form.

All these aspirated words must be kept distinct from those where the aspirate is original; they may be known by the fact that the aspirate (or the regular substitute) occurs in none of the cognate languages, except in some few cases in the Sanskrit, which shared with the Greek these peculiar hard aspirates.

In Latin, where the aspirates had early vanished, no change of the sort was likely to take place. But both in Greek and Latin irregular aspiration at the beginning of a word seems to have been known. I have already said that this is possible among people who are in the habit of leaving out the breathing where it ought to occur at the beginning of a word; and both Greeks and Romans were in the habit of doing this. Different as was the origin of *h* in the two languages, it is quite certain that the letter was rapidly vanishing in each of them at the classical period of their literature, or even earlier; and the tendency has gone on increasing among the inheritors of these languages, till, for the modern Greek at least, the sound is utterly lost, while the Romance languages have partially preserved it, with great irregularity of usage. Still, there is also an unmistakeable tendency to introduce the breath-

CH. IX.

No certain example of the aspiration of soft sounds.

Aspiration in Greek and Latin at the beginning of a word.

¹ *Gr. Et.* 466, &c.

² See p. 335.

CH. IX.

ing where it ought not to be, as distinct though less frequent in its operation than the other. First, in Greek, apart from numerous plain errors on inscriptions, such as ἄγγελον, ἐπὶ, εἰς, &c.¹, we may observe a strong inclination to aspirate an initial *υ*; e.g. in ὕδωρ, ὑπό, ὕστερος, &c. where it is certain that there was no aspirate in the original language. This seems to me very natural: it is more difficult to pronounce *u* pure than any other vowel, in consequence of the extremely narrow passage for the sound through the lips: witness our English *u* before which a *y* is regularly heard: and we have already seen that the Greek *υ* was probably a modified *u*, something like the German *ü*: for which sound the breath is even more intercepted than for *u*, since the tongue approximates more nearly to the palate, being in the position for *i*²: it is true that we should rather have expected *y* than *h* before the *υ*; but we have already seen that initial *y* regularly passes into *h* in Greek: and in exact accordance with this theory the Boeotian, which keeps the old sound, and denotes it by *ου*³, keeps the proper smooth breathing; e.g. in οὐμές, οὐδωρ, &c.⁴: although in other words the Boeotians were by no means peculiarly averse to the rough breathing, even inserting it in words where it was absent in other dialects, as ἰων for ἐγώ. The Aeolic, however, in the main inclined most to drop initial *h*: the Attic retained it most, and also used it most often wrongly; thus the Aeolic keeps ἄμμες for ἀσμές, while the Attic aspirates, as ἡμεῖς. I agree with Curtius here in regarding the rough breathing as a simple mistake, on the analogy of ὑμεῖς, where it denotes a lost *y*⁵, rather than suppose that it is due to the *σ* passing into *h*, as ἀημες, and then becoming misplaced: as he says, the *σ* does its part in lengthening the preceding vowel, and therefore would have exerted a double influence if it had become the breathing as well. But I

¹ Gr. Et. 617.² See p. 272.³ Gr. Et. 642.² See page 97.⁴ See Ahrens, i. 169.

think the theory more probable in the case of *ἡμαι*, from AS, as I have already said¹; and some other words, as *ἱερός* for *ισαρός*, Doric *ιαρός*, Sanskrit *ishira*². Still, many cases remain where no explanation can be given, except that they are mistakes. Such are the already often-quoted *ἵππος* (compared with *ἵκκος*, and the compounds *Λεύκιππος*, "Ἀλκιππος³"); the Attic *ἥλιος* and *ἑώς*, which have the smooth breathing in all the other dialectical forms: and Curtius suggests that the rough breathing of *ὄρος*, "a boundary" (Ionic *οὔρος*, Doric *ὄρος*), may have sprung up through a wish to distinguish it from *ὄρος*, "a mountain⁴:" but another derivation is possible. Lastly, Curtius gives the Attic *ἀμαρτεῖν*, whereas Homer said *ἡμβροτον*. These examples—all common words—are enough to shew the prevalence of the error: the derivation of the last one is somewhat uncertain; but as to the others there can be no reasonable doubt, from comparison with other languages and dialects, that they commenced originally with the smooth breathing, and that the rough *h* is a Greek, generally Attic, addition.

In the Latin this corruption seems to have been of later date. According to Corssen⁵, *h* is never wrongly inserted in the inscriptions of the Republic. The grammarians however of the first century B.C. and the early Empire seem to have been very uncertain in their deliverances on the subject: still, where wrong, they err almost entirely on the side of leaving out an *h* which is etymologically correct. The feeling on the point is well shewn by the often-quoted dictum of Nigidius Figulus: "Rusticus fit sermo, si aspires perperam." Also in Catul-

It began in Italy first among the provincials.

¹ See p. 344.

² See *Gr. Et.* No. 614. This rare Sanskrit word is said to mean "strong," "sound," "fresh," and so we are enabled to get at the primary sensuous meaning of *ἱερός*, and explain the use in certain combinations which are unintelligible so long as we have only the derived sense of "sacred," e.g. *ἱερὸν ἡμαρ*, *ἱερός δμβρος* (Soph. O. T. 1428), and even *ἱερός ἰχθύς* (Il. xvi. 417), and *ἱερὸν κύμα* (Eur. Hipp. 1216), Lidd. and Scott, s.v. Thence, as what was consecrated to the gods must be sound and perfect, the word came early in Greek to mean "sacred."

³ Schleicher, *Comp.* 219.

⁴ See p. 160.

⁵ *Ausspr.* i. 105.

CH. IX.

lus' epigram, Arrius, who aspirates wrongly, is clearly described as being of an illiterate stock¹. In conformity with this we find that in the best and oldest MSS. the *h* is often wrongly omitted, as *arena*, *aruspex*, &c.: rarely wrongly inserted, as in *humor*, *humerus*, &c. These however are trifles to the extraordinary blunders committed by the stonemasons in the inscriptions of the fourth century of the Christian era: such as *hac* for *ac*, *hornat*, *hextricata*, *exhistimantes*, &c., quoted by Corssen².

6. *Auxiliary (inorganic) vowels.*

Character
of these
sounds:
most com-
mon in
Greek.

These vowels are perhaps the farthest extension of the principle which we are considering. They frequently appear to be actual gain, and not loss to a word, causing the addition of a new syllable: and so are difficult to reconcile with the other manifestations of phonetic change. Yet these vowels are distinctly inorganic, as can in almost every case be proved by comparison with other languages. That they should be dynamic is excessively improbable; what change of meaning is likely to have been intended by sounding *ἐλαχὺς* instead of *λαχὺς* (*laghu*, *le(gh)uis*, &c.), or *ἀλεγεινός* beside *ἀλγεινός*? It is from vowel-insertions like the last, or from vowel-prefixes like *ἐ-χθές* for *χθές*, that we gain the conviction of the really phonetic character of these sounds: and accordingly I believe that they arose first from the difficulty of pronouncing a consonantal group, which became much easier when parted by a slight vowel-sound (if in the middle of a word), or if preceded by the same, when initial. Instances of this are well known in modern languages, e.g. in the French *état*, *espèce*, *espérance*, *étoile* from *status*, *species*, *sperare*, *stella*,

¹ I have already mentioned (at page 21) Roscher's argument, chiefly from Cicero, *Orat.* 48, 160, in which he maintains against Corssen that this use of the *h* was a common corruption in the provincial speech, and was just beginning in Cicero's day to steal into the language of educated men.

² *Ausspr.* p. 110.

&c., and the corresponding Spanish forms *esperanza*, *estrella*, and *estava* (= *stabat*): and a vowel similarly prefixed occurs in the late Latin of the fourth century after Christ, as *ispirito*, *istatua*. Compare also the Welsh *ysprid* for *spiritus*, *ysgol* for *schola*, and many others. In these words the *y* (which seems to me to be the neutral vowel in Welsh) is really irrational; it hardly amounts to a syllable, and so is clearly auxiliary only.

But it is not easy to see why this use should be extended to words which do not begin with a compound sound, but only with an easy letter like λ or ρ , μ or ν : and it is especially before these that this inorganic vowel is found; it occurs very rarely before a simple explosive sound; before τ , π , ϕ never¹. But the reason for this difference is not far to seek; a protracted sound has something of the vowel-character about it, and therefore a vowel can easily slip through the lips before it²: in sounding the four letters *l*, *m*, *n* and *r* especially, the vocal tube is so open that it is easy to let a pure vowel-sound escape at some part of the time during which they can be prolonged. But before a momentary sound the vowel must have been consciously added. Accordingly I believe that this new parasitic sound sprang up before certain liquids and nasals after it had been familiarised to the "Sprachgefühl" by use in cases where it was almost necessary. I do not deny that in some cases a prefixed vowel may be not parasitic, but the remnant of some corrupted prefix, most naturally of a preposition: and this, as might be expected³, is often assumed by Prof. Pott: e.g. he regards *ἀμέργω* as *ἀπομέργω*, like *ἀπομάσσω*, &c.⁴. I do not think this likely, because I know no analogy for a similar loss of π ; but in some cases such a truncation is doubtless possible. Still in the great majority of cases I have

¹ *Gr. Et.* 678.

² Compare the irrational vowels in Latin, *u* before *l*, and *e* before *r*, p. 298.

³ See pp. 115—117.

⁴ *Et. Forsch.* II. 386.

CH. IX.

(i) Initial vowels.

no hesitation in regarding the vowel as the purely phonetic result of indolent articulation.

I will give examples first of the vowel when initial¹. Several have been incidentally mentioned in the previous chapters. Thus ἀ-στήρ, as we saw, is from STAR: whence also ἀστράπτω and ἀστραπή: to derive them from a root AS, "to throw" (which occurs in Sanskrit, but not, I think, in the other languages), is not so good. Similarly ἀ-σπαίρω is an easier form of σπαίρω: ἄ-σφι is a Lesbian form of σφί: κίς and χθές have the by-forms ἰκτίς and ἔχθές: the rare word ὄ-τλος² seems to be most naturally connected with √τλα in ἔτλην: ὄνομα is most likely for ὄ-γνομα. Before a single liquid we have the parasitic ε in ἐ-λαχύς, ἐ-ρετμός, ἐ-ρεύγω (Lat. *ructo* from √rug), ἐ-ρυθρός, ἐ-λαύνω for ἐ-λα-ννω³; α in ἀ-λείφω, ἀ-μείβω, ἀ-μέλγω, &c.; ὀ in ὀ-λίγος, ὀ-ρυγμός, and perhaps Ὀ-λυμπ-ος from √λαμπ, by the Aeolic variation of α and υ. There are plenty of other examples, more or less uncertain, of the vowel in this connection. The ε is probably prefixed before ν in εἶργω for ἐ-Φέργ-ω (Sk. √νृṣṭi), ἐ-Φέρσ-η (Sk. √νृṣṭish), ἐέκοσιν for ἐ-Φικοσι (uiginti)⁴. I have already accounted for the occurrence of this vowel as being one of the many ways in which the Greeks struggled to avoid an initial ν. Before a simple explosive sound the best examples are perhaps ἀ-κούω, ὀ-κέλλω by κέλλω⁵, ὀ-δάξ, and most likely ὀδούς; it is not probable that if the vowel had been original (so that the word should be derived from ED, "to eat"), it would have been lost in all the derived languages; Sanskrit *danta*, Latin *den-ts*, Lithuanian *dant-i-s*, and German *Zahn*. The cases are very few in all, but they are peculiar extensions of the common usage which I cannot explain. It will be seen that the vowels

¹ See *Gr. Et.* 673, &c.² Aesch. *S. c. T.* 18.³ *Gr. Et.* 677.⁴ *Comp.* p. 78.⁵ Blomfield (on Aesch. *Prom.* 191) lays down that where the two forms occur side by side, as κέλλω and ὀκέλλω, the first seems to be preferred by poets, the second by prose writers. If this be so, it points to the insertion of the vowel being felt to be a license, on the assumption that Greek and Latin poets always followed the stricter rule.

Very rare
before an
explosive
sound.

regularly found in this use are *a*, *e*, *o*, the strongest vowels. The reason is probably this: at first the prefixed vowel would be the same as the radical vowel¹, though in actual use there are plenty of exceptions to this rule; and the vowel *A* in its triple form occurs, as I have already remarked, much oftener in roots than *I* or *U*.

I pass to the insertion of a vowel between consonants in the middle of a word. These cases are more doubtful, because sometimes the fuller form may be the older, and the vowel have been lost out of it. Thus Schleicher² regards the *ε* in *ὀρέγω* as inserted, and by comparison with Sanskrit *√arj*, arrives at an Indo-European ARG. But the Latin form is *reg-o*, and we have *rak-jan*, "to reach," in Gothic. It is therefore at least as probable—I think more so—that the older form was RAG; and that *o*, not *ε*, was the auxiliary vowel; and therefore *ὀρόγνυα* the older form of *ὀργυιά*. Other examples, which seem more certain, are given by Schleicher and Curtius³: e.g. *ἀλ-ε-γεινός* mentioned above; *ἦλ-υ-θον* from the simple root *ελ*, whence the secondary root is *ελθ*; *μαλ-α-κός* by *μαλκός* (Hesychius)—the *θ* in *μαλθακός* is again the result of dynamic strengthening of the root—*δολ-ι-χός* from original *dargha*, Sanskrit *dārgha*; *ἀλ-έ-ξω* beside *ἀλκ-ή*, the Latin *arc-eo*: *πινυτός* is from *√πνυ*. Apparently we have a suffixed *ε* forming for many verbs a secondary base in common use. Thus *√μελ* forms its present stem by the affix *γο*, as *μέλλω*: but this stem is phonetically increased by *ε*, whence comes the future *μελλ-ή-σω*, and the aorist *ἐμέλλ-η-σα*. Similarly *√μαχ*, "to fight," has a secondary form *μαχε*, which is actually used for the present in Ionic, and forms the Aorist *ἐ-μαχε-σάμην*. These new forms, which are rather common⁴, have nothing to do with the formation of stems, for the new vowel commonly runs through them all: and as it is generally rather late, and

(ii) Medial vowels.

¹ W. Christ, *Lautehre*, 19, quoted by Curtius.

² *Comp.* p. 76.

³ *Gr. Et.* 679, &c.

⁴ Curtius gives thirty-eight examples in his excellent School Grammar, which is translated and published in Dr Smith's series, see p. 198.

CH. IX.

The "connecting vowel."

produces no change of meaning in the verb, the vowel is probably a mere phonetic insertion, closely akin to the "connecting vowel" (the German *Binde-vocal*), which is so important in the conjugation of verbs. The object of that vowel is to preserve the final consonant of a root from all possible injury when it is connected with suffixes beginning with consonants; e.g. in forming the second person of $\sqrt{\text{βολ}}$ or $\sqrt{\text{βουλ}}$, the Greeks insert ϵ before $\sigma\alpha\iota$, as $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\text{-}\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\text{-}\epsilon\text{-}\alpha\iota$, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$, so that in all these changes the λ has not suffered; on the contrary, the Latins, who in a few verbs (as $\sqrt{\text{es}}$, $\sqrt{\text{ed}}$, $\sqrt{\text{vel}}$, $\sqrt{\text{fer}}$) do not regularly employ a connecting vowel, lost the final consonant in *uol-s*, *uil-s*, *uis*. I cannot agree with Schleicher, who (following Bopp) regards this vowel as a demonstrative root¹, whose original form was a (preserved in Sanskrit and weakened in other languages, in Greek to ϵ and o , in Latin to i and u , according to the following sound). I can see no proof of such a view: and prefer to regard the vowel as simply phonetic, and belonging in its origin to the class which we are here considering; at a later time of course it became one of the arbitrary forms of grammar. It is worth observing that the oldest verbs (so far as we can trace the historical development of the verb) in Sanskrit, in Greek, and in Latin, do not generally possess these connecting vowels; and it is just as likely that they never had them, as that they had them and lost them. Bopp's objection however is no doubt forcible, that a the strongest of the three primary vowels is least of all adapted for a mere phonetic link²; and is not quite met by the reply that a does not occur in Greek³ and Latin, and that the Sanskrit a is not the full vowel of the primitive language. Still, the evidence seems to me to preponderate for the view that I have given⁴.

¹ *Comp.* p. 343.

² *Comp. Grammar*, vol. II. p. 694, English translation.

³ Except perhaps a few verbs, such as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{-}\alpha\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\pi\acute{\rho}\iota\text{-}\alpha\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$, &c.

⁴ See, on the whole question, Curtius *Erläut.* pp. 107—110 (Engl. trans.).

In Latin there is, I think, no prefixed vowel as in the Greek: it was not in accordance with the genius of the language. Even within a word it was not common, with the exception of the regular connecting vowel—if the theory of the phonetic origin of this vowel be true. It is observable however that those verbs, mentioned above as not regularly taking the connecting vowel, do take it irregularly, as *(e)s-u-m(i)*, *(e)s-u-mus*, *(e)s-u-nt(i)*: so also *fer-i-mus*, *fer-u-nt(i)*, &c. Such further vowel insertion as occurs in Latin belongs to the early more than to the later period of its records: this is shewn by the Latin forms of borrowed words, e.g. *Aesc-u-lapius* for 'Ἀσκληπιός, *Alc-u-mena* for 'Ἀλκμήνη¹, *drach-u-ma* for δραχμή², and the common *mina* for μνᾶ. These vowels (varying, as we have seen, according to the following consonant) are not generally found in the later Latin. In *balatro* (compared with *blatero*) there may be an inserted *a*³: such vowel insertion is common in Umbrian, arising from the masses of consonants produced by original vowel-loss. The fact too, that auxiliary vowels are especially frequent in the Oscan⁴, shews that the principle was one originally common to the Italian with the Greek; which naturally became less and less operative in Latin, as the vowel-system became with every century weaker⁵.

Schleicher thinks that *um-e-rus* (Sanskrit *añsa*), *rub-e-r(o)*, *gen-e-r(os)*, Greek γαμ-β-ρός, &c. are examples of the insertion⁶. I do not see why they should not be distinct Latin forms with the suffix *-ero*. Such difference of formation is perfectly common in the most certainly cognate words of different languages. Even though there may have been one common form in use in the time

¹ E.g. Plaut. *Amph.* 99. See page 283.

² Plaut. *Trin.* 425 (ed. Brix).

³ Corssen, II. 384.

⁴ Kirchhoff, *Zeitsch.* I. 36, quoted by Curtius, *Gr. Et.* 680.

⁵ English examples are common enough, especially borrowed words, e.g. *alar-um* (à les armes), *alcoh-o-l* (al-kohl), &c.

⁶ *Comp.* p. 102.

before the separation of the two peoples, yet after that separation a new form may easily have sprung up among one of the two nations, more agreeable to the phonetic laws which time had developed, and so superseded the old one.

7. *Auxiliary (inorganic) Consonants.*

These are not very numerous either in Greek or Latin, though sufficiently so to require a special mention. They are among the most decisive signs of a decomposing language, and therefore are rather to be looked for in more modern tongues, as *gen-d-re* and *nom-b-re* in the French¹. A familiar instance may be found in English in the name of Ambleside in Westmoreland; which is by derivation Hamal-seat or -sett; Hamal is a common Norse name: and the true form is still pretty nearly kept in the more correct local pronunciation. In "thunder" the *d* is interesting, because it does not occur between two consonants, and yet is unquestionably a parasitic insertion: compare the Anglo-Saxon *thunian* and German "Donner:" in some parts of the North of England the word is still rightly sounded as "thuner:" the very full sound of the first syllable seems to be the cause of the need which is felt of a connecting link between it and the following vowel².

The examples in Greek are very sporadic. We find *ἀν-δ-ρος* from *ἀνερ*; the Sanskrit *nara* with the same meaning seems to point to the *δ* as being parasitic: *μεσ-ημ-β-ρία* and *(μ)-β-ροτός* are well-known examples: in the

¹ Schleicher, *Comp.* p. 233.

² Plenty of examples in English may be seen by turning over the pages of any dictionary, e.g. a-d-miral (=emir-al, Milton's amiral), a-d-vance (a-vancer, *ab-ante*), a-d-vantage, al-d-er (A.S. alr), &c. An auxiliary consonant is also found at the end of words, as lamb (A.S. lam), sound, the vulgar gownd, &c.: compare the Norwegian *mand* (for man), *falde* (to fall), &c.

latter the radical μ has been expelled by the consonant which it joined to produce: and $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\text{-}\beta\text{-}\lambda\alpha\kappa\alpha$ stands for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\mu\lambda\omega\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ from $\sqrt{\mu\omicron\lambda}$: $\eta\mu\text{-}\beta\text{-}\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ stands beside $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\text{-}\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$. There are a few others of the same kind.

In Latin the only examples which are given by Schleicher¹ are the words in which p is inserted between m and s , or m and t : as *hiem-p-s*, *sum-p-tum*, &c. The greater ease of sound in the words so modified is obvious. Mr. Ferrar² holds the s in words like *monstrum* to be a similar insertion: I think it much better to suppose (with Corssen) a form *mon-es-trum*, like *fen-es-tra*, &c. So also in *abstineo*, *sustineo*, *ostendo*, &c. I believe that the s belongs to the preposition³.

I have thus endeavoured to set forth the main points in which the languages spoken by the Greeks and the Italians varied from the speech of their common forefathers—both from that of the Graeco-Italian race, out of which they immediately sprang, and from that of the race to which we, as well as all the civilized nations of Europe, trace our descent. I have endeavoured incidentally to point out any light which these divergencies cast on the character of the different peoples. But my main object has been to point out the common reason of all these changes in language; to shew that they all sprang from the same desire for ease of articulation; whether that tendency produced a weak or an indistinct sound instead of a stronger or a clearer one, the principle was the same: and the only cause which can be taken into account as stemming the progress of this change, or (very much more rarely) causing change in the opposite direc-

Conclu-
sion.

¹ *Comp.* p. 266.

² *Comp. Gram.* p. 175.

³ For the form *abs* and its use, see Corssen, i. 154.

CH. IX.

tion, was the instinctive desire to keep distinct and unconfused the terms which expressed distinct conceptions. I have in no case endeavoured to give all the examples which might have been given in support of the views advanced : those who care for the matter will prefer, and will find it far more useful, to seek out others for themselves. I have been obliged in the nature of the case to bring forward many facts familiar to all who are acquainted with even ordinary Greek and Latin grammars. But my aim has been to present facts, old in the main, under a new light. Only so far as I have succeeded in giving the reason for what often appear mere arbitrary anomalies ; only so far as I have been able to trace many apparently isolated results to the operation of one common principle ; just so far have I attained the object which I had in delivering the course of Lectures, which I now present in a rather fuller and more methodical form.



NOTE TO CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK AND LATIN VARIATIONS OF THE CASE-SUFFIXES.

I here give (as promised at page 58) two tables shewing the case-suffixes, attached (1) to the stems which end in a consonant, (2) to those which end in a vowel. Stems, however, which end in *i*, *u*, or a diphthong, must be assigned to the 1st or consonantal declension; these sounds have a semi-consonantal character. Thus, for example, whilst the genuine vowel-stems—those which end in *a* or its modification *o*—take *m* or *n* to make the neuter nominative, those which end in *i* and *u* either never did take the consonant, or have lost it, agreeing with the consonantal-stems, here as in other particulars. Some few Greek stems ending in *o*, as *πεῖθο-*, or *ω*, as *ῥέω-*, must be added to the consonantal stems: these have lost a final consonant. See Curtius, *Erläut.* 56—60, Engl. transl.

The following tables are compiled, except in the matter of the dialects, from Schleicher; I have also borrowed slightly from Curtius, Bücheler, and Ferrar's *Comparative Grammar*. I have not entered into the question of the original meaning of these forms, and need hardly refer to Bopp's *Grammar*, which has long been accessible in English. The objections of Curtius (*Erläut.* pp. 184—199, Engl. trans.) to the "local" theory, at least in its widest extent, deserve the most careful consideration.

I. CONSONANTAL DECLENSION.

Sing.	Indo-Eur.	GREEK.		LATIN.	
		δπ-s	— πόλι-s, dentals lost, ἐρι-(δ)-s, πᾶ(ντ)-s; but φρήν (φρεν-s), &c.	uoc-s,	— abie(t)-s, mor(t)-s; but uigil(-is).
Nom.	s	δπ-α(μ)	— πόλι-ν and (some dentals) ἐριδ-α(ν) or ἐρι(δ-α)ν; in Aeolic δισμένην (= δισμέσες + αν), also πᾶν.	uoc-em.	
Acc.	am	σώφρον-ος, σαφ(έ)s-ος, ταχέ(F)-ος (eu from radical <i>v</i> by vowel-intensification): in all these the vowel is long, probably on the analogy of the vowel-declension: perhaps πόλε(y)ος, ἀστρ(F)-ος.	uoc-ed,	or uoc-id.
Abl.	at		— πόλι-ος (Ion.), πάλη-ος (e.g. <i>Il.</i> 16. 549) equivalent to πάλειν-ος, in Homer and Aeol.; λῆ-ος = βασιλευ-ος, in Homer and Aeol.; θέρε(σ)-ος (e.g. <i>Od.</i> 7. 118 and Aeol.).	uoc-is	— senatūs (= senatu-ος, <i>Ep. de Bacc.</i>)
Gen.	as		— used as adative: πόλε(y)-ι and πόλει, Ion. πόλι: σαφ(έ)σ-ι: often apparently heteroclite in Homer: e.g. παρακότερι (<i>Od.</i> 3. 381), δάει (<i>Od.</i> 6. 130). The locative sense retained in names of places: e.g. Ζαλαμύν-ι.		
Loc.	i			
					<p> rur-i, arbor-i (Livy, 1. 26). Anxur-i: the long vowel following the other declension, the forms in which are commoner. </p>

Dat.	ai	uoc-i	— rege-e (shortened and weakened to e).
Instr. I.	ā	παυτ-ā (Dor.) = παυτῆ, τᾶχα, δῖχα (Dor. δῖχᾶ), perhaps <i>iva</i> (i. e. <i>yι-ν-ā</i> , Schl. 579).	
Instr. II.	bhi	δχες-φῖ, ῖ-φῖ.	
Dual.			hardly found in Doric or Aeolic	(wanting)	
N. Acc.	(s)ās	δπ-ε	— πῶλε(y)-ε.	
G. L.	aus	
D. Abl. Instr.	bhāms	δπ-ο-ῖν	— πῶλε(y)-ο-ν; these forms are very irregular; a connecting vowel o has been inserted, on the analogy of the other declension; and bh has been dropped. In πῶδ-ο-ῖ-ν the ι seems to represent the original y.	
Plur.				uoc-e-s.	
Nom.	s(as)	δπ-es	— πῶλε(y)-es, Ion. πῶλι-es.	uoc-e-s.	
Acc.	ams	δπ-as	— πῶλε(y)-as, Ion. πῶλι-as, πῶλῖs.	uoc-um,	au-i-um
Gen.	(s)ām(s)	δπ-ων	— πῶλε(y)-ων, Ion. πῶλι-ων.	
Loc. I.	sva(s)	δπ-σι	— used as dative: πῶλι-σι (Ion.), βασιλεῖ-σι; πῶλε(y)-σι (intens.); πῶλε-σσι (Il. 17. 236); with connecting vowel (probably) ἐπέ-(σ)-ε-σσι (Hom. for ἐπεσ-ε-σσι); ἐλθόντ-ε-σσι (Aeol.); μακρό-ε-σσι (Theok. 1. 126); then by analogy also πῶλε(y)-ε-σσι (Il. 12. 399) or πῶλ-ε-σσι (Od. 21. 252).	uoc-i-bus,	au-i-bus, no-b(e)is.
D. Abl.	bhāms	ναῖ-φιν, δχες-φιν, also used as a singular (Od. 4. 533), κοτυληδόν-ό-φιν (Od. 5. 433).	
Instr.	bhis	ἐν-τός, ἐκ-τός [cf. Sk. a-tas, &c.].	in-tus, sub-tus.
? Loc. II.	tas	

II. VOWEL-DECLENSION.

Sing.	Indo-Eur.	GREEK.			LATIN.		
		GREEK.			LATIN.		
Nom.	s	νεανίας;	οἰκο-ς;	Hom. ἱππότα: τυκτα (Theok. 8. 30).	scriba(s);	uico-s.	
Acc.	m	νεανία-ν;	οἰκο-ν.		scriba-m;	uico-m.	
Abl.	at;	πῶς, ὥς, &c., οὐτως and οὕτως, perhaps τῆνός (Theok. 3. 26).	scribā(d);	uicō(d).	
Gen.	syā	νεανιά-ς(-ο);	οἰκο-το } -ου }	Ἀρτέδαο (Hom.), νεανίωσ (Ion.), Ἐρμείω (Hom.), πολίτα-ν (Arcad.); οἰκω = οἰκο-ο (Dor. sev.), τεύ (West Asia).	scriba-i. }	uic(o)-i; familiā-s (ā-stem).	
Loc.	i;	οἰκο-ι;	χαμα-ί; ποῖ; ἀμαχε-ί, &c.; πεί (Theok. 2. 1); τούτῃ-ι (Theok. 5. 45); τυ-ί-δε (Theok. 28. 3); ἀμ-σθ(ο)-ί. Some of these pass into the sense "towards"; compare our <i>where</i> = <i>whither</i>;	Romā-i (ā-stem), domi (i. e. domo-i), Corinthi, &c.: here-i (Mil. Glor. 59).
Dat.	ai	νεανιάτ;	οἰκω.	ἄμα (ἀμα, Od. 6. 105): perhaps adverbs in ω, e. g. ποτ-έρω (Od. 4. 36).	(scribāi) }	uicō(ī); quōi (inser.).	
Instr. I.	ā;	πασσαλό-φι (Od. 8. 67), &c.	-ae }	
Instr. II.	bhi;	so οἰρανό-θι πρό (Il. 3. 3), Νυό-θι προ (Il. 3. 561).;	
Loc. II.	dhi;	οἰκο-θι;	σέ-θεν and ἡδ-θεν (Hom. and Aeol.), πρόσ-θα (Aeol.), τούτό-θε (Theok. 4. 10): [ἐνθεν = Sk. <i>adhas</i>].;	
Abl. II.	dhas;	οἰκο-θεν;	[Forms apparently peculiar to Greek, and of doubtful origin.			
	;	οἰκα-δε,	and οἰκόνδε (Ion. not Dor.; ? Aeol.);			
	;	ἔρα-ξε, Ἀθήνα-ξε: perhaps both this and the preceding suffix arise from an original <i>ye</i> , of pronominal origin.			
	;	οἰκο-σε:	ἄλλο-σε (Od. 23. 184, and Att.), δμώ-σε (<i>id.</i> .)]			

<i>Dual.</i>	(s)ās	<i>veavīā;</i> oīkω.;
N. Acc.;;
G. Loc.	bhyāms	<i>veavīā-u;</i> oīko- <i>u</i>;
D. Abl. Instr.			
<i>Plur.</i>	(s)as	<i>veavīā-t;</i> oīko- <i>t</i> .	scriba-i } uic(o)-i. -ae }
Nom.	ams	<i>veavīā-(v)-s;</i> oīko- <i>vs</i> }	scribā-(m)s; uicō-(m)s.
Acc.	sām(s)	<i>veavi(a)-ōw;</i> oīk(o)-ōw:	scriba-rum; uico-rum.
Gen.			scrib(a)-i-s; uic(o)-is ; used as datives and ablatives : Athen-i-s, foris, &c. keep the locative sense.
Loc.	sva(s)	<i>veavīā-t-σ(i);</i> oīko- <i>t-σ(i);</i>	
D. Abl.	bhyams;;; dea-bus, &c., from ā-stems.
Instr.	bhis;;
? Loc.		[Forms of doubtful origin. <i>oīka-dīs</i> (Ar. Ach. 742), <i>χαιμᾶ-δīs</i> (Od. 4. 114), <i>δαλαυδīs</i> (Il. 11. 486). <i>αὐθ-δīs</i> .];
? Loc. II.	dhis;;

I. INDO-EUROPEAN INDEX.

A

√ a (pronominal), 51 n.
 -a (nominal suff.), 52, 149
 -a- (stem suff.), 55
 √ak, 103, 104, 181, 234, 239, 405
 aktan, 233
 akva, 156, 235, 405
 √apa, 115
 √ag, 235
 √ad, 234
 a-dik-sam (i), 237
 √agh, 84, 134, 341 n., 361
 aghi, 134
 abharami, 5
 abharanti, 6
 √an, 142
 -an (nominal suff.), 52, 56, 147
 -ana (nominal suff.), 52, 147
 -aya (verbal suff.), 52, 54, 342, 417
 -as (formative suff.), 6
 -as (nominal suff.), 52, 56, 236
 √as (to be), 34, 151
 √as (to throw), 430
 √as (sit), 240
 √av, 155
 avi, 233, 350
 √ar (to fit), 34, 341 n.
 √ar (to propel), 158, 159
 √arg, 431
 √arbh, 139

I

√i (pronominal), 51 n., 149
 √i (verbal), 41, 50, 55, 201
 -i (nominal suff.), 52
 √ik, 390
 √idh, 200

U

-u (nominal suff.), 52
 √us, 152, 153 n., 203

K

√ka (pronominal), 51 n., 107, 406
 -ka (nominal suff.), 52

ka (and), 74
 √kap, 204
 katvar, 107, 413
 kankan, 406
 √kar (to make), 353
 √kar (to move), 407
 kara, 105
 karka, 106
 √kard, *ib.*
 √kal, 197, 338
 √kalp, 338
 √ki (to be quiet), 64
 √ki (to move), 105
 √kru, 335

T

√ta, 108
 √ta (pronominal), 51 n.
 -ta (nominal suff.), 52, 55, 56
 -ta + ta, 53, 55
 -ta + na, *ib.*
 -ta + na, 53
 -ta + ya, 52
 -ta + ra, 53
 √tak, 111
 √tag, 235
 tamas, 109
 √tan, 108
 √tar, √tra, 46, 50, 111, 176
 -tar (nominal suff.), 52, 56, 140, 234, 239, 278
 √tark, 46
 √tal, 176
 tati (nominal suff.), 109
 -ti (nominal suff.), 52
 √tuk, 111
 tva, 392
 -tra (nominal suff.), 52
 √tram, 46
 √tran, *ib.*
 √tras, *ib.*
 √tri, √tru, 46, 50
 √trib, 47, 111
 √trup, 47
 √trugh, *ib.*

P

√pa (drink), 338
 √pak, 167, 335
 patar, 140, 234
 √pag, 235
 pad, 6
 padas, 6, 7
 √par (cross), 112
 √par (fill), 112
 √pal, 113
 √pu, 202, 203 (cleanse)
 √pu, 203 (strike)
 √plu, 371

G

√ga, 47, 117, 240
 √gan, 44, 47, 49, 117, 119
 ganā, 119
 ganu, *ib.*
 √gal, 411
 √gar, 44, 45, 411
 gāni, 119
 √gnā, 49, 50, 117, 239
 √gnāman, 57

D

√da, 41, 50, 121
 dakan, 232, 237
 dakr, 20
 √dagh, 339
 dama, 125
 √div, 37, 122, 124, 416
 daiva, 352 n.
 daivar, 124, 125
 √dyu, 416
 √drak, 123
 √drus, 121

B

baita, 126
 √bandh, 233 n.
 √bargh, 127

GH

gham(a), 133
 ghaman, *ib.*
 √ghas, 361
 √ghar, 133
 ghartya, 134
 √ghi, 143, 361
 ghyas, 361

DH

√dha, 38 n., 48, 56, 135, 359 [place]
 √dha, 135, 136, 181 [milk]
 √dhar, 358

-dhi (nominal suff.), 52
 -dhi (personal suff.), 401
 -dhi (case suff.), 56
 √dhu, 136, 137
 dhuma, 137

BH

√bha, 47, 138, 358
 √bhag, 121 n.
 bhaga, 120
 √bhar, 5, 138, 234, 341
 bharamas, 286
 bhavant, 138
 √bhu, 60, 138, 341 n., 358
 √bhug, 167, 192, 358
 -bhyas, 325
 √bhrak, 371
 bhratar, 140
 √bhrag, 369

M

√ma (pronominal), 2, 51 n.
 √ma (verbal), 47, 50, 144, 146, 182, 240
 -ma (nominal suff.), 52, 55, 56, 146
 -ma + ta, 53, 55
 -ma + na, 52, 234
 matar, 140
 √mad, 146
 √madh, *ib.*
 madhu, 137
 √man, 47, 49
 -man (nominal suff.), 146, 156
 -mant (nominal suff.), 52, 56, 147, 156
 -mas (pers. suff.), 205 n.
 √mar (grind), 144, 349
 √mar (measure), 146
 √marp, 144
 √mard, *ib.*
 √mu, 203
 √mnā, 49

N

√na (pronominal), 51 n.
 -na (nominal suff.), 52, 56, 147
 -na (stem suff.), 53, 55
 √nak, 110, 196
 nakta, 277
 √nap, 337
 √nadh, 151, 152
 nava, 236
 nar(a), 144
 -ni (nominal suff.), 52, 147
 √nu, 202

-nu (nominal suff.), 147
-nu- (stem suff.), 53, 55

Y

√ya (pronominal), 51 n., 149, 419
√ya (verbal), 54, 276
-ya (nominal suff.), 52, 56
-ya- (stem suff.), 53, 54, 334
-ya (verbal suff.), 52, 55
√yam, 417
-yant (nominal suff.), 150, 342
-yans (nominal suff.), 52
yantar, 148
yāra, *ib.*
√yu, √yug, √yudh, 45
√yu, 148
√yug, 416
yuga, 148
yusa, 149
yuvan, 125

S

√sa, 188
√sa (pronominal), 51 n.
sa (with), 345
√sak, 55
√sad, 232
√sar, 161
√sarp, 136
√siv, 151
√su, 341
suluā, 20
-ska- (stem suff.), 54
√skap, 123 (look)
√skap, 240, 275 (support)
√skad, 116, 370
√skar, 370
√skav, *ib.*
√ski, 117, 201
√sku, 203, 370
√sta, 65, 110, 188, 424
√stap, 110
√stambh, 110, 111
√stan, 109, 109 n., 370
√star, 370, 430
√stal, 110, 370
√stav, 110
√sti, 111
√stib, *ib.*
√stigh, 191
√spak, 5 n., 199
√spar, 113, 278
√spal, 113, 370
√spu, 370
√spur, 113, 278
√spul, 278

√sphar, 113
√sphal, *ib.*
√smar, 146, 181
√smi, 369
√snigh, 143, 367, 411
snusa, 144, 367
sva, 393
√svap, 197, 370
√suad, 193, 240
sva, 344
√svan, 197
√svar, 343
√svik, *ib.*
√sru, 347, 369

V

√va, 155 [blow]
√va, *ib.* [hurt]
√va (pronominal), 51 n.
-va (nominal suff.), 52
√vak, 15, 275
√vagh, 132
-van (nominal suff.), 156
-vant (nominal suff.), 52, 57, 147, 156
√vas, 153, 170 [clothe]
√vas, 152, 153, 276 [dwell]
vasa, vasara, 170
√var, 123, 145, 159 (look at)
√var, 348 (wish)
var (speak), 159
√varg, 315 n.
vāk, 239
√vi, 154
√vik, 156
√vid, 123
vira, 156
vaika, *ib.*
√vrak, 368

R

-ra (nominal suff.), 52
√rag, 431
√ru, 203
√ruk, 157
√rup, 408
√rudh, 134, 359
rudhira, 359

L

√las, 161
lala, 162
√ligh, 361
√libh, lubh, 161
√lu, 162 (cut)
√lu, 203 (wash)
√luk, 123, 124, 157, 203
√lup, 408

II. GREEK INDEX.

A

άατος, 156
άβείδω, 348
άβελιος, 152, 348
άβρός, 338
άβώρ, 348
άγαθός, 34
άγαμαι, 432 n.
άγγέλλω, 392
άγειν, 426
άγνυμι, 186
άγχι, 134
άγχονη, 134, 142
άγχου, 134
άγχω, *ib.*
άγωγή, 181, 196
άγωγός, *ib.*
άγωνοθεσία, 277
√άδ, 193
-αδ- (nom. base), 420
άδδην, 419
άδειν, 193
άδελφεός, 342
άδελφίδεος, 418
άδελφός, 140, 345
άδην, 419
άδνός, 392
άδων, 257
άελιος, 152
√άF, 153 n.
άFημι, 155
άFος, 150
άήρ, 153 n.
άήτης, 153 n., 155
άθάνατος, 213
άθεος, 37 n.
αί, 240
αία, 120, 392
αίγειρος, 201
αίγικορείς, 407
αίγίς, 201
αίδιος, 417

αίδοός-αιδώς, 260
αίFει, 347
αίθήρ, 200
αίθος, *ib.*
αίθω, 38 n., 200
αίξ, 234
αίπόλος, 407
ά-ί-ρ-ω, 54, 342
αίσα, 350
αίσυμνήτης, 278
αίτας, 155
αίχμη, 424
αίων, 201
√ακ, 181
άκ-μων, 104
-ακο-, 289
άκόλουθος, 202
άκούω, 430
άκ-ρος, 103, 235
άκ-ωκ-ή, 103, 181, 196, 235
άκων, 235
άλάθεια, 343
άλαλάζω, 173
άλδαινω, 365
άλε-γευός, 428, 431
άλειφα, 339
άλείφω, 424, 430
άλέξω, 431
άλευρον, 349
άληθές, 56, 375
άληθες-γα, 56, 314 n.
√άλθ, 365
"Αλκαος = *Άλκαϊος*, 251, 313
"Αλκιππος, 427
άλληλῶ, 402
άλλυδης, 279
άλς, 161
√άλφ, 139
άλφειν, *ib.*
άλφησται, *ib.*
άμβροτος, 144
άμειβω, 430
άμεινων, 342
άμείρω, 419

ἀ. μέλγω, 302, 430
 ἀμέργω, 429
 ἀμέρδω, 419
 ἀμίων, 277
 ἀμμες, 386, 426
 ἀμνός, 350
 ἀμοιβή, 206
 ἀμπέλος, 261
 ἀμυδισ, 279
 ἀμφάδιος, 418
 ἀμφήν, 350
 ἀμφί, 235
 ἀμφιλαφής, 365
 ἀμφιπύλος, 408
 ἀμφω, 235
 ἀνα(κτ), 375
 ἀνδάνω, 193, 194
 ἀνδρε-ιο-s, 247, 341
 ἀν-δ-ρός, 434
 ἀνέθεικαν, 253
 ἀνέθειαν, 277
 ἀ-νέψ-ιος, 337
 ἀνήρ, 144
 ἀντιάζω, 417
 ἀντιάω, *ib.*
 ἀνυστός, 401
 ἀνύ-τ-ω, 54
 ἀοιδή, 206
 ἀπ-αλός, 338
 ἀπαυράω, 156
 ἀπηγνής, 143
 ἀπίκατο, 32
 ἀπικολάτο, 32
 ἀπλά, 260
 ἀπλό, 115
 ἀπολαύω, 162
 ἀπονέεσθαι, 213
 ἀπούρας, 156
 ἄπτω, 194
 ἀπύ, 31 n., 274, 279
 ἄπυγονος, 279
 ἀραρίσκω, 182
 ἀράχνη, 373
 ἀργύριος, 276, 342
 ἀρήγω, 196, 335
 Ἄρι-άδνη, 392
 ἀρίζηλος, 416
 ἀριστος, 341 n.
 ἀροτρον, 158
 ἀρόω, *ib.*
 ἀρρηκτος, 386
 ἀρρωδέω = ὀρρωδέω, 32
 ἀρχῆος, 250
 ἀρωγός, 196
 ἀς, 150, 258, 344
 ἀσμες, 51 n.

ἀσουλία, 272
 ἀσπαίρω, 114, 430
 ἀστεμφής, 111
 ἀστέον, 401
 ἀστήρ-, 36
 ἀ. στήρ, 430
 ἀ. στραπή, *ib.*
 ἀ. στραπτω, *ib.*
 ἄσφι, *ib.*
 ἄτερος, 236
 ἀτ-ιτ-άλλω, 276
 ἄτρακτος, 46
 Ἄτρείδας, 5 n.
 Ἄτρείδεω, *ib.*
 ἀτρεκής, 46
 αὐ, 51 n.
 αὐάτα, 156
 αὐγεῖν = ἀλγεῖν, 364
 αἶθηρ, 348
 αἶθις, 366
 αὐκά = ἀλκή, 364
 αὐξάνω, 203
 αὔος, 152
 αὔσος = ἄλσος, 364
 αὔτευν, 259
 αὔτις, 366
 αὐτμήν, 155
 αὐτῷ, 250
 αὐχμός, 152
 αῶω, *ib.*
 αῶως, 152, 348
 ἄφενος, 424
 ἄφθιτος, 381
 ἄχ, 142
 ἀχεῖν, 276
 ἀχῆν, 234
 Ἄχῆος, 250
 ἀχθομαι, 134
 ἀχθος, *ib.*
 Ἀχιλλείος, 248
 Ἀχιλλεύς, 20
 ἄχος, 134, 142, 361
 -αω (verb), 342
 ἄως, 152
 ἄωτος, 153

B

√βα, 118 n., 181, 240
 βάθος, 194 n., 218, 277
 βαθύς, 411
 βαίνειν, 371, 411
 βαίτη, 126
 √βαλ, 411
 βάλλω = βάλ-γω, 54
 βᾶμες, 259
 βανά, 411

βαρύς, 126, 411
 βασιλεΰς, 150 n.
 βασιλέως, *ib.*
 βασιλῆος, *ib.*
 βατός, 240
 βέβαιος, 181
 βέβ(α)λῆται, 313
 βέβηλος, 181
 βέβλημαι, 240
 βείκατι, 348
 βέκας, *ib.*
 βελτίων, 126
 βένθος, 219
 βέργον, 348
 βέτος, *ib.*
 βηλός, 240
 βήσσω, 389
 βία, 411
 √βιF, 415
 βίος, 411, 415
 βιώω, 415
 βλέφαρον, 424
 βλήχω, 126
 βοηθεῖν, 244
 βοῦ, *ib.*
 √βολ, 237, 432
 βόλβος, 302
 βόλλομαι, 237, 348
 βορά, 126, 411
 βορέας, 160
 βό-σκω, 54, 184, 218
 βουκόλος, 407
 βουλε(σ)(α)ι, 432
 βούλομαι, 126, 237, 348, 349
 βοῦς, 119, 233
 βραδινά, 393
 βράκος, *ib.*
 βράσσων, 342, 389
 βράχιαι, 425
 βραχύς, 127, 410
 βραχυτητο-, 240
 βρέμω, 126, 365
 βρέχω, 126
 βρήτωρ, 393
 βρίζα, 126, 393
 βρόδον, 393
 βροτός, 126, 434
 βροχέως, 235
 βύθος, 219, 277
 βυκάνη, 127
 βύκτης, *ib.*
 βώλομαι, 348
 βωμός, 240
 βώσομαι, 260

Γ

γα = γε, 236
 γά, 120
 γαῖα, *ib.*
 γάλα(κ)τ, 375, 377
 γαμβρός, 433
 γαμ-έ-ω, 54, 315
 √γαρ, 44
 γαρ, 180
 γαργαρίζειν, *ib.*
 γαστήρ, 371
 γέγονα, 230, 239
 γεγόναμεν, 238
 γελᾶσα, 258
 √γεν, 43, 44, 188
 γένε(σ)ε, γέννη, 260
 γένε(σ)ος, 236, 283
 γένος, 36, 43, 236
 γένους, 346
 γένυς, 365
 √γερ, 44
 γέρων, *ib.*
 γῆ, 119, 120
 γηγενής, 243
 γηρεύειν, 44
 γῆρυς, *ib.*
 γίγας, 243
 γίγνομαι, 43, 188, 275, 293, 313
 γλαφυρός, 46, 338
 γλουκού, 272
 √γνω, 117
 γόνυ, 119
 γοώσα, 258
 γουνός, 348
 γράβδην, 391, 420
 √γραφ, 391
 √γρε, 44
 γύη, 120, 392
 γυνή, 119

Δ

-δα, 413
 -δα (patronym.), 420
 δαῆναι, 123
 δαήρ, 124, 338
 δαιδάλλω, 181
 δα-ί-ω, 54, 342
 δάκρυ, 339
 δάκρυμα, 20
 √δαμ, 49
 δάμν, 253
 Δαν, 392
 δάπης, 337
 -δε, 419
 δέατο, 123

δέδαα, 123
 δεδίδαχα, 188
 δεδύκω, 187
 δέελος, 123
 δειδίσσονται, 180, 181
 δεικελον, 422
 δείκῃλα, *ib.*
 δέκα, 232, 237
 δέκομαι, 366
 δεξι-τερος, 234
 δέχομαι, 366, 424
 -δεν, 420
 Δεύς, 391
 δή, 418
 δημόφεν, 340 n.
 δῆλος, 123
 Δημήτηρ, 392
 δῆν, 418
 -δην, 419, 420
 √δι, 180
 διαινώ, 422
 δαιτα, 415
 διακρία, 416
 διαλος, 123
 διανθής, 416
 διάω, 414
 διδάξω, 188
 διδάσκω, 182, 188
 διδομεν, 2, 190
 διδόμενος, 234
 διδόναι, 235
 διδους, 375
 διδωμι, 1, 3, 50, 182, 186, 190, 239, 276
 διF-γο-s, 37, 122
 -δίην, 420
 √δικ, 422
 Διονούσιος, 272
 διος, 37, 122
 -διος, 418
 √διωκ, 422
 √δμα, 49
 δνόφος, 392
 √δο, 122, 173, 186
 δοάσσατο, 123
 δόγμα, 223, 391
 √δοκ, *ib.*
 δοκ-έ-ω, 54
 δολιχός, 431
 δόμον = damam, 88
 δόμος, 37, 125, 200 n.
 -δον, 419
 δός, 375
 δόσις, 2, 50, 186
 δότηρ, 2, 50, 56, 186, 239
 δούς, 261

√δρακ, 123, 124
 δρακείν, 123
 δράκων, 124
 √δραμ, 124 n.
 δυγόν, 418, 421
 δύο, 348
 δύσεως, 314 n.
 Δωρίς ανειμένη, 29
 δώσω, 183, 186, 187
 δώ(τι)s, 239

E

εἰδα, 193
 ἐ(σ)ανός, 343
 εἰανός, 154
 εἶαρ, 169
 ἐβδο-μο, 55, 337
 ἐβολλόμαν, 386
 ἐγείρω, 371, 401
 ἐγνωκα, 401
 ἐγγελευς, 134
 ἐγχος, 424
 ἐγω, 365
 √εδ, 48, 124 n., 181, 197
 ἐδδειςεν, 422, 423
 ἐδειξα, 237, 375
 ἐδιδουν, 186
 ἐδος, 232, 275, 343, 344
 ἐδρα, 276
 ἐδωδή, 181, 197
 ἐδωκα, 183, 186
 ἐδων, 183, 186
 εἰκοσιν, 430
 ἐέρση, *ib.*
 ἐφείκοσι, 350
 ἐφέργω, *ib.*
 ἐφιση, *ib.*
 ἐζομαι- (ἐδ-γ-ομαι), 334, 390
 εἰ, 240
 εἶδος, 207, 347
 εἰ (εἰσι), 190, 199
 εἶην (εἰς-γα-μι), 55
 εἰκόνες, 422
 εἴκοσι, 236, 336
 εἰκτον, 199
 εἰκών, 199, 422
 εἰλήλουθα, 202
 εἰμι, 190, 199, 261
 εἰνάτερες, 148
 εἰπόμεν, 313
 εἴργω, 430
 εἴρω, 161
 εἰς = eis, 426
 εἰς, 261
 εἰστήκει, 344

ἐκλίθην, 201
 ἐκτείνωμεν, 238
 ἐκτείνομεν, *ιδ.*
 ἔκτονα, 401
 ἔκτυπον, 343
 ἔκυρος, 370
 ἐλάσσων, 389
 ἐ-λαύνω, 430
 ἐλαφρός, 411
 ἐλαχύς, 234, 411, 428, 430
 ἐλεύ(θ)σομαι, 202
 ἔλιπον, 407
 ἐλπί(δ)ς, 420
 ἐλπίζω, 417
 √ἐλυθ, 202, 365
 ἐμαχασάμην, 431
 ἐμβαίνω, 392
 ἐμέρα=ἡμέρα, 244
 ἐμίο, 259
 ἔμμα, 386
 ἔμμαθε, 368, 423
 ἐμμί, 261, 386
 ἔμπειρος, 392
 ἔμπορος, 112
 ἐμφαίνειν, 382
 √ένεγκ, 124 n.
 ἐνθαῦτα, 381
 ἐνθεῖν=ἐλθεῖν, 364
 ἐνιπή, 390
 ἐνίπτω, 275
 ἐνίσσω, 390
 ἐννυμι, 154, 348, 386
 -εντ, 156
 ἐντός, 306
 ἐξαίφνης, 424
 εἰκα, 199, 422
 εἰκε, 422
 ἐορτή, 350
 εὐός, 259
 ἐπαίνω, *ιδ.*
 ἐπάξα, 258
 ἐπ-είγω, 207
 ἐπεκέατο, 32
 ἔπεσον, 188, 275
 ἔπετον, 188
 ἐπήβολος, 244
 ἐπηε-τανο-, 53
 ἐπηλυδ-, 365
 ἐπί, 115, 116, 426
 ἐπίβαθρον, 424
 ἐπίβολος, 243
 ἐπιμελουμένης, 260
 ἐπίουρος, 160
 ἐπίσκοπος, 115
 ἐπλάγην, 193
 ἔπλετο, 313

ἔπομαι, 407
 ἔπορον, 113
 ἐποψ, 175
 ἐπτά, 237, 288
 ἔργον, 36 n.
 ἐρεῖν, 160
 ἐρέσθαι, *ιδ.*
 ἐρέσσω=ἐρετ-γω, 54
 ἐρετμός, 158, 430
 ἐ-ρεύνω, 430
 ἐρίσδεν, 261
 √έρπ, 118 n.
 ἔρπειν, 136
 ἔρπετον, 235
 ἔρρωγα, 194, 196
 ἔρση, 370
 ἐρυθρός, 359, 430
 √ἐς, 151, 343
 ἐσ(ε)πόμεν, 313
 ἐσθής, 343, 348
 ἐσθίω, 48, 124 n.
 ἐσθλοί, 34
 ἐσμέν, 191
 ἔσπερος, 348
 ἔσσο-αι, 386, 388
 ἐστάλαται, 32, 364
 ἔστελλα, 386
 ἐστί, 343
 ἔστιχον, 198
 ἐστράφη, 195
 ἔστροφα, *ιδ.*
 ἔστω, 271
 ἐ(σ)ύς, 343
 ἔσχον, 132, 313
 ἐτέθην, 381
 ἐτεός, 151, 342
 ἔτραφον, 195, 233
 ἔτασαν, 386
 ἐτύθην, 401
 ἔτυπτον, 375
 εὐ, 151
 εὐθεῖν=ἐλθεῖν, 364
 εὐπνοια, 314 n.
 εὔρεα, 250
 εὐρος, 152
 εὐς, 151
 εὐσέβε(σ)ια, 341
 εὔτε, 342
 εὔω, 152
 εὐώνυμος, 279
 ἔφαγον, 124 n.
 ἔφερον, 1, 1 n., 2, 5
 ἐφίζω, 116
 ἔφυνον, 202
 Ἐφύρα, 278
 ἔφυ(τ), 375

ἔχει—ναίχι, 252
 ἔχεμεν, 238
 ἐχεμέναι, *ib.*
 ἐχθές, 428
 ἐχιδνα, 134
 ἐχίς, 134, 234
 ἔχομεν, 228
 ἔχοσι, 254
 ἔχω, 195, 238
 ἔχωνθι, 277, 385
 ἔψω, 275
 -εω (verb), 238, 342
 ἔως (till), 150, 150 n., 258
 ἔως (dawn), 152, 341 n., 427

F

√Fā, 155
 √Faγ, 369 n.
 √Faλ, 349
 Fάστυ, 152
 Fεικατι, 336
 Fείπην, 347
 √(F)ελ, 237
 √(F)εμ, *ib.*
 √Fεπ, 15, 237, 275
 Fέπος, 407
 √Fερ, 160
 √Fes, 154, 343
 Fέ(σ)αρ, 354
 Fεσθής, 154
 √Fεχ, 132
 √Fiδ, 123, 124 n., 277
 Fiδελν, 346
 Fiκατι, 236
 (F)οῖκος, 156, 199
 √For, 123, 124 n., 145, 160, 278
 Fότι, 88
 √Fραγ, 196
 Fρηξίς, 369
 Fυκία, 250

Z

ζα-, 416
 ζάθεος, *ib.*
 Ζάκυνθος, *ib.*
 ζαμενής, *ib.*
 ζάω, 414
 -ζε, 419
 ζεά, 417
 ζεία, *ib.*
 √zes, *ib.*
 ζευγος, 207
 Ζεύς, 390, 416
 Ζέφυρος, 278

ζέω, 417
 ζημία, *ib.*
 ζητέω, *ib.*
 ζοῖα, 248
 ζορκάς, 422
 ζύγον, 45, 148, 416, 417, 418, 421
 ζυμή, 417
 ζωμός, 149, 417

H

ηγέομαι, 235
 ἡδη, 418
 ἡδίων, 342
 ἡδύς, 240
 ἡέλιος, 152
 ἡκω, 187
 ἡλιος, 427
 ἡλυθον, 202, 431
 ἡμβροτον, 427, 435
 ἡμεῖς, 51 n.
 ἡμένος, 343, 344
 ἡμέρα, 244
 ἡμερος, 417
 ἡμῖ, 261, 341 n.
 ἡνιος, 417
 ἡνίπαπε, 390
 ἡπαρ, 245, 342, 407
 √ἡς, 343
 ἡς, 261
 ἡσσων, 389
 ἡσται, 343, 344
 ἡσθα=ξ(σ)ησθα, 198
 ἡύς, 151 n.
 ἡώς, 152, 153 n.

Θ

√θα, 111, 136, 181
 -θα (personal), 129
 √θαF, 136
 -θαι, 56
 θάλασσα, 387
 θάμβος, 111, 137, 218, 219, 365
 √θαπ, 111
 θᾶσαι, 136
 θᾶσθε, *ib.*
 θαῦμα, *ib.*
 √θε, 37, 48, 116, 135
 θέα, 136
 θεαρός, 240
 θεα(σ)ων, 353
 √θεF, 137 n.
 θεηπόλος, 408
 Θειβῆος, 252, 253
 θεῖναι, 136

θεῖος, 37
 θεός, 37, 37 n.
 θεός (monosyll.), 256
 θερίδδεν, 391 n.
 θερμός, 14, 359, 385
 θέρος, 170, 171
 √θεσ, 37
 θεσσαλατο, 136
 θέσαντο, 37
 θέω, 137 n.
 √θη, 135
 θηλή, ib.
 θήλυς, ib.
 θήρ, 245, 380
 θησαλατο, 136
 θήσατο, ib.
 θήσθαι, ib.
 -θι, 401
 θιόρ, 346
 θιός, 276
 θναίσκω, 251, 261
 θόος, 137 n.
 θουγάτειρ, 253, 272
 -θρον, 424
 θρώσκω, 184
 √θυ, 137, 137 n.
 θύειν, 137
 θύελλα, 137, 137 n.
 θυμοραΐστων, 250
 θυμός, 137, 204, 358
 θύος, 137
 θύρα, 125, 358
 θύψω, 401
 θύων, 137

I

√ι, 118 n., 199
 ιαίνω, 422
 ιάλλω, 276
 ιαμβος, 390
 ιάπτω, ib.
 ιαρός, 234, 427
 Ἰάρων, 236
 ιαύω, 276
 ιαχέω, ib.
 -ιδ- (nom. base), 420
 ιδεῖν, 123, 346
 ιδιος, 418
 ιδίω, 54, 342
 ιδμεν, 233 n., 348, 392
 ιδρύω, 276
 ιε-μενο-, 52
 ιεράδδω, 418
 ιερός, 234, 427
 ἱζω, 275

ἱημι, 276, 401
 √ικ, 198, 422
 ἱκελος, 422
 ἱκετής, 156
 ἱκκος, 405, 427
 -ικο-, 289
 ἱκτίς, 430
 ἱμεν, 190, 199
 ἡμέρα = ἡμέρα, 244
 ἱμι, 253
 -ιον, 150
 ἱορκες, 422
 ἱος, 155
 ἱπνός, 275
 ἱπος, 407
 ἱπποιο, 342
 ἱππος, 108, 156, 235, 275, 345, 405
 ἱππου, 343
 ἱππυς = ἱππους, 250
 ἱππω, 259, 260, 343
 ἱράνα = ἐιρήνη, 253
 ἱρον, 253
 ἱσασι, 204
 ἱσθι, 275
 ἱσμεν, 204, 392
 ἱσος, 419 n.
 ἱσος, ib.
 ἱστε, 204
 ἱστημι, 2, 194, 293, 401
 ἱστία, 276
 -ιστο-, 318
 ἱστωρ, 348
 ἱττω, 277, 386, 388
 ἱψηλος, 279
 ἱωκή, 422
 ἰών, 277, 350, 426
 ἰωνθι, 277

K

κάγων, 257
 κα-ί-ω, 54, 218, 342
 κακισ-το-, 55
 κακίων, 150
 κακκαβή, 175
 καλινδέω, 278
 κάλος, 419 n.
 καλύπτω, 308, 338
 κάναστρον, 305
 κάπετος, 368
 κάπηλος, 204
 καπνός, 370
 κάπρος, 371
 κάρα, 105
 καρδ-ία, 106, 235
 κάρηρε, 244

κάρκαρον, 176
 κάρουα, 273
 κάρουξ, 272
 κάρπασος, 338
 κάρχαι, 106
 κάρχινος, *ib.*
 κασσύω, 151
 κατέπτακον, 194
 κατύ, 31 *u.*, 279
 κατωμάδιος, 419
 κατωμαδόν, *ib.*
 κανσία, 203
 καύσω, 218
 κείμαι, 104, 199, 275 *n.*
 κέκευθα, 218
 κέκλημαι, 240
 κέκλωμαι, 188
 κέκρᾱγα, 193
 κέκραξ, 181
 κεκρύφαλος, *ib.*
 κέλευθος, 202
 κέλλω, 430
 κενεός, 342
 κεννός, 386
 κενός, 343
 ✓κερ, 275
 κέραος, 106
 κέρας, 106, 236
 κέρατα-αα, *ā*, 260
 κέρα(τ)ος, 372
 κεύθω, 203
 κῆ = καί, 253
 κῆγών, 257
 ✓κι, 104, 105, 199, 275 *n.*
 κιθών, 5 *n.*
 κίκιννος, 176, 181
 κιμένas = καί, 253
 κινέω, 105
 κίνυμαι, *ib.*
 κίον, *ib.*
 κίρνημι, 275
 ✓κλαγ, 218
 κλάγγω, *ib.*
 κλαξῶ, 343
 κλέφος, 335, 347
 κλειθρον, 424
 κλιτύς, 201
 κλυθι, 401
 κνέφας, 392
 κόγχη, 130
 κόθεν, 406
 κοικύλλω, 181
 κόϊλος, 248
 κοιμάω, 199
 κοίος, 12, 107
 κοίτη, 104, 199, 206

κόρδαξ, 106
 κόρζα, 31 *n.*
 κορυθ, 53
 κόρυς, *ib.*
 κορύσσω, 53, 387
 κοσκυλμάτια, 176
 κοτέ, 51 *n.*
 κοῦ, 107
 κουζικηνός, 272
 κόγχη, 131
 ✓κραγ, 193
 κραδία, 371
 κράζω = κραγ γω, 54, 193, 194
 κρέσσων, 387
 κρίνω, 386
 κρίνω, 201
 κρύπτω, 365
 ✓κρυφ, *ib.*
 κρύφα, *ib.*
 ✓κτα, 240
 κτείνω, 393 *n.*
 κτέννω = κτενγω, 223, 386
 κτήμα, 240
 κτυπέω, 342
 ✓κυ, 248
 κυβερνάω, 336
 κύκλος, 277
 κυλίνδω, *ib.*
 κύμη, 104
 κυνοραιοστῶν, 250
 Κυνουρία, 368
 κυρ-έ-ω, 54, 342
 κύρω, 342
 κύτος, 204, 368, 370
 κύων, 407
 κωμάζω, 305
 κώμη, 104
 κωμοπόλεις, *ib.*
 κῶμος, *ib.*
 κῶς, 51 *n.*

A

✓λαβ, 181
 ✓λαθ, 173, 193
 λαίλαψ, 181
 λαΐον, 162
 λαΐον, *ib.*
 λαιός, 201
 ✓λακ, 193
 λάκειν, *ib.*
 λαλαγείν, 180
 λαλείν, 162
 λαμβάνειν, 217, 218 *n.*, 365
 ✓λαμπ, 430
 λανθάνω, 173, 193

λαός, 5 n.
 λάσκω, 193, 194
 λάφυρα, 365
 λάω, 161
 λεία, 236
 √λέγ, 223, 392
 λέγει, 325
 λέγε(μ)εν, 247, 248, 260
 λέγεται, 27
 λέγην, 252, 260
 λέγεις, 253
 λέγομεν, 376
 λέγομεν, *ib.*
 λέγουσιν, *ib.*
 λέγω, 4
 λέγων, 375
 λεία, 162
 λείχω, 207, 361
 λείψις, 198, 218
 λεκτός, 223, 391
 λέλαθα, 193
 λέλακα, *ib.*
 λέλεκται, 223
 λελιμμένος, 161
 λέλοιπα, 186, 198
 Δεύκιος, 203, 254
 Δεύκιππος, 427
 λευκοπέπλος, 253
 λευκός, 124, 157, 203, 207, 255
 λεύσσειν, 123, 124
 λεχθήναι, 391
 λεώς, 5 n.
 λήϊς, 162
 λῆμα, 161
 λαν, *ib.*
 λιθάω, 417
 λιλαίομαι, 161
 √λιπ, 186, 198
 λίπτομαι, 161
 λίσσομαι, 54, 387, 388
 λόγος, 43, 213
 λόγο-(σ)ι-ο, 247
 λόγω [gen.], 255
 λοιβή, 206, 218
 λοιγός, 207
 λοιπός, 198
 λούειν, 203, 235, 371
 √λυ, 60, 202
 λύθρον, 203, 424
 √λυκ, 123, 124, 157
 λύκος, 408
 λύρα, 20
 Δυσίμαχος, 162
 λύχνος, 424
 λύω, 60, 162

M

μαθεῖν, 146
 μαιμακτηρίων, 181
 μαιμάκτης, *ib.*
 μαιμάω, *ib.*
 μαινομαι, *ib.*
 μαίνομαι, *ib.*
 μαιώρης, 244
 μαλακός, 235, 431
 μάλευρον, 349
 μαλθακός, 431
 μάλλον, 350
 μάντις, 145
 √μαρ, 180
 μαρμαίρω, 173, 180
 μάρπτω, 350
 μάρτυρ, 278
 μαχαίτας, 251
 √μαχ(ε), 431
 √με, 182
 μέγα, 129, 234, 365
 μεγαλοσθένεις [nom. sing.], 253
 μέδειν, 146
 μέδιμνος, *ib.*
 μέζων, 391
 μέθυ, 137
 Μεθύδιον, 406
 μειδιῶ, 367
 √μελ, 431
 μέλαινα, 341
 μέλδομαι, 350
 μέλλω, 431
 μέλω, 197
 μέμβλομαι, 188
 μέμβλωκα, 435
 μέμηλα, 197
 μέμονα, 145
 μεμφόμη, 252 n.
 √μεν, 188
 μένειν, 144, 188, 234
 -μενο-, 305
 μένος, 145
 Μέντωρ, *ib.*
 √μερ, 146, 180, 419
 μέριμνα, 146, 367
 μερμηρίζειν, 180, 181
 μέρος, 146
 -μες, 2
 μεσημ-β-ρία, 434
 Μεσοποταμία, 405
 Μεσσάπιοι, *ib.*
 μέσσος (μεθγος) 340, 387
 μέτρον, 240
 μῆλον, 350
 μῆνι(δ)ος, 420

μῆνις, 145
 μηρύω, 350
 μηχανάωτο, 32
 Μιλλατος, 386
 μιμέομαι, 182
 μιμνήσκομαι, 188
 μίμνω, 188, 313
 μίσγω, 335
 μογιόμεις, 259
 μοῖρα- (μορ-γα), 341
 μοῖσα, 247, 261
 √μολ, 435
 μολπῖς, 350
 μόσχος, *ib.*
 μου, 51 n.
 μῶνος, 348
 Μουρίνα, 272
 μοῦσα, 145, 247, 254
 √μρο, 144
 μύζω (μυγω), 334
 μύλη, 277
 μῶσα, 247

N

ναύλοχος, 35 n.
 ναῦς, 203
 ναυσί-θος, 35 n.
 ναῦφι, 372
 νέ(F)os, 236
 νέκυσ, 110
 νεο-τατι, 109
 νέποδες, 337
 νεῦρον, 207
 νεύω, 202
 νέφος, 140
 Νικοστράτα, 252
 νίφα, 207, 367
 νίφας, 143
 νίφειν, 411
 νύξ, 275 n., 277
 νυός, 143, 367
 νώ, 51 n.
 νώνυμος, 279

Ξ

ξέω, 202
 ξόανον, *ib.*
 √ξυ, *ib.*
 ξύανον, 279
 ξύν, 277

O

ο, 51 n.
 ογδοος, 337
 ο(γ)νομα, 118, 430

ο. δάξ, 407
 Ὀδυσσεύς, 339
 ὀδμή, 392, 392 n.
 ο. δούς, 430
 ὀδωδα, 197, 339
 ὀδωδή, 181, 197
 ὀφῖς, 154, 235
 ὀζειν, 235
 ὀζω=ὀδ-γω, 54, 390
 ὀθεν, 149
 ὀθι, *ib.*
 οἶδα, 59 n., 123, 204, 233 n.
 διδα, 248
 οἴκοι, 372
 οἴκοφι, 207
 οἴκτος, *ib.*
 οἶμος, 199, 206
 οἶνός, 207
 οἶνος, 206
 οἷς, 248
 οἶσθα, 129, 131, 204
 οἶτος, 206
 ο. κέλλω, 430
 ὀκκος, 390
 ὀκνος, 402
 ὀκτώ, 233, 235, 337
 ο. λγός, 430
 ὀλκος, 302
 ὀλλυμι, 387
 Ὀλυμπος, 430
 ὀμβρος, 365
 ὀμμα, 386
 ὀμνάσθην, 235
 ὀμόφυξ, 148
 ὀμφαλος, 302
 ὀμφη, 424
 ὀν, 235
 ὀνειδος, 207
 ὀνία, 235
 ὀν-ιν-ημι, 276
 ὀνομα(τ), 57, 118
 ὀνος, 235
 ὀνυξ, 277
 ὀπαδός, 419
 ὀπάζω, *ib.*
 ὀπάων, *ib.*
 ὀπ-ιπ-εύω, 276
 ὀπός, 235
 ὀππα, 386
 ὀπποτα, *ib.*
 ὀπτομαι, 407
 ὀπωπή, 181
 ὀπώρα, 170
 √ορ, 159
 ὀράν, 123, 145, 160
 ὀργάδες, 315 n.

ὀργάω, 315 n.
 ὀρέγω, 431
 ὀρείχαλκος, 269
 ὀρεσί-τροφος, 35 n.
 ὄρευσ, 257
 ὄρη, 257 n.
 ὄρνις, 121
 ὄρνιτο, 382
 ὀρνυμαι, 235
 ὄρος, 160, 427
 ὄρ(ο)γυιά, 431
 ὄρος, 160, 427
 ὀρόων, 258
 ὀρπετον, 235
 ὀρνυγή, 365
 ὀ-ρυγμός, 430
 ὀρύσσω, 365
 √ὄρυχ, *ib.*
 ὄρωρα, 159
 ὄς (σνα), 344
 ὄς, 51 n., 149
 ὄσμή, 392
 ὄσσα, 390
 ὄσσε, 235, 390
 ὄσσομαι, 386
 ὄστέον, 235
 -στ, 156
 ὄτλος, 430
 ὅττι, 342
 ὅττις, 386
 οὔ, 149
 οὔδραίνω, 273
 οὔδωρ, 426
 οὔθαρ, 359
 οὔμές, 272, 426
 οὔρος, 160, 427
 οὔτάω, 156
 οὔτος, 51 n.
 οὔτοσ-ι, *ib.*
 οὔτως, 376
 οὔψιβίας, 273
 ὀφθαλμός, 118 n.
 ὀφρύς, *ib.*
 ὄχλος, 132
 ὄχος, 132, 195, 195 n.
 -ώω, 238, 342

II

√παγ, 167, 335
 πάγ-ιος, 341
 √παθ, 218
 πάθος, 194 n., 219 n.
 παιπάλη, 114, 176
 παῖς, 248
 παῖω, 203

παλεόρ, 346
 πάλλα, 114
 πάλλω, 114, 368
 παμφαίνειν, 180
 πανήγυρις, 278
 πᾶσα, 388
 πάσσαλος, 167, 302, 335
 πατέρα, 375
 πατερ-ός, 236
 πατ(ε)ρός, 314, 317
 πάχνη, 425
 παχύς, 219, 410, 425
 πεζός, 416, 419
 πειθώ, 198
 πείρα, 112
 πε-ί-ρ-ω, 54
 πεισίβροτος, 198
 πείσμα, 392
 πείσομαι, 261
 πέλεθος, 368
 πέλω, 408
 πέμπε, 15, 16, 406, 407
 πένθος, 194 n., 219
 πέντε, 15, 16, 275
 πέπηγα, 194
 πέποιθα, 198, 218, 293
 πέπονθα, 218
 πέπορθα, 195
 πέπτω, 15
 πέπων, 407
 περ' = φερ', 382
 περάω, 112
 πέρδω, 373
 πέρθω, 195
 περιέρνυτος, 386
 πέρνημι, 112
 πέροχος, 386
 πέσσω, 390
 √πετ, 188, 275
 πέτταρες, 414
 πεύθομαι, 191
 πέφ(ε)νω, 47, 313
 πέφενγα, 191, 202, 206
 πέφυκα, 206, 381
 πεφύκω, 187
 πήγνυμι, 167, 194, 335
 πηδάω, 243
 √πι, *ib.*
 √πιδ, *ib.*
 πίδαξ, *ib.*
 πιέζω, 116
 √πιθ, 173, 198, 215
 πιθανός, 173, 198
 πιθανότης, 173
 πιθανόω, *ib.*
 πιθος, 116

πίμπλημι, 113
 πινυτός, 431
 πιπράσκω, 112
 πίπτω, 188, 275, 313
 πιστός, 401
 πίσυρες, 16, 223, 276, 414
 πίτνω, 275
 √πλακ, 389
 πλακοῦς, *ib.*
 πλάξ, 371, 389
 πλατειασμός, 29, 241
 πλάτος, 371
 πλέ(φ)ω, 207
 πλῆθος, 113
 πλήσιος, 392
 πλήσσω, 389
 πλύνειν, 371
 πνεῦμα, 202, 207
 πνεύω, 348
 πνέω, 202
 πνοή, *ib.*
 √πνυ, 180, 202, 431
 πόδας, 7, 237
 πόδες, 7, 237, 337
 ποδοῶν, 372
 ποδός, 7, 237
 ποέω=ποιέω, 343
 πόθεν, 406
 ποιητής, 121
 ποικίλος, 207
 ποικιλόφρων, 215
 ποιμήν, 375
 ποῖος, 12, 406, 415
 ποιπνύω, 180, 181
 ποιφύσσω, 181
 πολεμαρχίω, 277
 πολεύω, 408
 πόλιος, πόλι, &c., 32
 πόλις, 113, 393
 πολλός, 387
 πολύ(ο)s, *ib.*
 πολύχρσος, 21
 πόρ, 346
 πορθμός, 112
 πορμός, 382
 πόρνοψ, 31 n.
 πόρος, 112
 πορφύριος, 276
 ποσσί=ποδ-σι, 223, 386
 Ποτίδαν, 252
 πούς, 261
 √πρακ, 389
 πράκος, *ib.*
 πρακ-τεο-, 52
 πραξιομεν, 342
 πραξοῦντι, *ib.*

πραξῶ, 342
 πράσσω, 387, 388, 389
 πράτος, 240
 πράττω, 387, 412
 πρέπαισα, 261
 πρηγής, 143
 πρίαμαι, 112, 432 n.
 προμηθεύς, 219
 πρὸς, 375
 προσηγής, 143
 προ-τερο-, 53
 πρύμνη, 278
 πρύτανις, *ib.*
 πρω-το-, 55
 √πτακ, 196, 389
 πτήσσω=πτάκ-γω, 54, 194, 196, 389
 πτίσσω, 387
 πτόλεμος, 393
 πτολίπορθος, 195
 πτόλις, 393
 √πτνχ, 424
 πτυχή, *ib.*
 πτώξ, 196
 πτώσσω, *ib.*
 √πυθ, 191
 πυλάξι, 382
 πυ-ματο-, 53, 56, 278
 πύργος, 113
 πυτίξω, 370
 πωλέομαι, 406
 πῶμα, 239

P

√ράκ, 196
 ράκος, 368
 ραχία, 425
 ρέος, 207
 ρεῦμα, 202, 207, 208
 ρέω, 202
 ρῆγας, 244
 ρήγνυμι, 194, 196, 218, 369, 425
 Ρήγουλος, 254
 ρηΐδιος, 417
 ρηκτός, 218
 ρήξω, *ib.*
 ρίξα, 368, 416
 ροή, 202
 √ρυ, 202, 367
 ρύγχος, 424

Σ

σαμφόρας, 229
 σάος, 343, 344

Σαπφώ, 380
 σαφές, 236, 343, 424
 √σεβ, 392
 σείρα, 161
 σελήμη, 343
 σεμνός, 392
 √σεπ, 407
 √σεχ, 132, 313
 σεύω, 202
 -σέω (Fut. verb.), 342
 σηκός, 408
 σήμεραν, 392
 σθένω, 424
 σιάλος, 279
 σίγη, 343
 σιδάριος, 276
 Σίκελος, 302
 σιός, 276
 Σίσυφος, 278
 -σίω, (Fut. verb.), 342
 σκάζω, 344
 σκαιός, 201
 √σκαπ, 338
 σκάπτω, 368
 σκάφος, 278, 424
 σκεδάννυμι, 217
 √σκεπ, 5 n., 124
 σκεῦος, 203, 207
 Σκηπίων, 275
 σκήπτρον, 214, 275, 338
 σκήπτω, 275
 σκήπων, *ib.*
 σκία, 117, 201
 σκιδ-να-μαι, 53, 217
 σκίδνημι, 217
 σκίμπους, 275
 σκινδάλαμος, 201
 σκίπων, 240, 275
 σκόλοψ, 46
 -σκοος, 207
 σκοπεῖν, 123
 σκοπός, 124
 σκύτος, 204, 368, 370
 σκύφος, 278
 σμύρνα, 369 n.
 (σ)νυός, 345
 συγγράφως, 272
 σούν = σύν, *ib.*
 σοφός, 424
 σπαίρω, 114, 129, 368
 σπάνις, 370
 σπάρτον, 277
 σπείρω, 114
 σπέλεθος, 368
 σπεύδω, 195 n., 202
 σπόγγος, 114

σπουδή, 195 n., 202
 √σπυδ, 195 n.
 σπυρίς, 277
 √(σ)ρν, 345, 367
 σταδῖος, 418
 στατός, 344
 σταῦρος, 110
 στέγος, 368
 στέγω, 369
 στείβω, 111
 στείχω, 191, 195 n., 198, 207
 στέλεχος, 110
 στέλλω = στελ-γω, 54, 110
 στέμφυλον, 110
 στένω, 109, 370
 √στεργ, 196
 στερεός, 342
 στεύμαι, 110
 στήμων, *ib.*
 στιβαρός, 111
 στιβάς, *ib.*
 στίβος, *ib.*
 στίζω (στιγ-γω), 334, 391
 στίλβω, 338
 στίλπ-νός, *ib.*
 √στιχ, 191, 195 n., 198
 στίχες, 198
 στοιβή, 111, 206
 στοιχος, 191, 195 n., 198, 207
 στόμα, 197
 √στορ, 369
 στορ-έν-νυ-μι, 53, 344
 √στραφ, 218
 στρέφω, 195
 στρόμβος, 218, 219
 στροφή, 195
 στύμα, 279
 στύμυλος, 197
 σύ, 392
 √συ, 202
 συγκαλέω, 392
 συλλέγω, 386
 σύν, 277, 368
 σύνη, 393
 συρρέω, 386
 σφαίρα, 114, 129
 σφάλλω, 114, 131, 369
 σφάσσω, 387
 σφε, 393
 σφενδόνη, 114, 369, 424
 σφίδη, 114, 369
 σφίσι, 418
 σφραγίδα, 420
 σφράγω, *ib.*
 σφυρίς, 424
 σφυρόν, 114

σφώ, 393
 σχεδίν, 419
 σχέδιος, 418
 σχεδόν, 419
 σχέλις, 424
 σχίζα, *ib.*
 σχίζω, 201, 334
 -σω (Fut. verb.), 343
 σώθῃτι, 401
 σῶμα(τ), 375

T

√τα, 108
 √ταλ, 49, 176
 τάλαις, 251, 261
 √ταν, 108
 τάναος, *ib.*
 Τάνταλος, 176
 τάπης, 337
 Τάρταρος, 176
 τάσις, 108, 346
 ταῦρος, 344, 368
 √ταφ, 111, 218, 365
 τάφος, 5 n., 111, 254
 τάφων, 111
 τε, 406
 τέγγω, 15, 410
 τέγος, 368
 τέθηπα, 5 n., 111, 137
 τειμά = τιμή, 252
 τε-ί-ν-ω, 54, 108, 342
 τείρω, 46
 τείχει, 250
 τεῖχος, 208
 τεκεῖν, 111
 τεκταίνομαι, 236
 τέκτων, 111
 √τεν, 108
 τένων, *ib.*
 τεοῦς, 259
 -τερ, 140
 τέρας, 375
 τέρενα, 341
 τέρην, 46
 τέσσαρες, 16, 107, 223, 236, 386,
 413, 414
 τέτανος, 108, 181
 τέταρες, 414
 √τέτ(F)αρες, 107, 223
 τετραπάλαι, 179
 τέτορες, 107, 223, 236, 414
 τέτροφα, 195, 233 n.
 τέτταρες, 223, 388
 τέττιξ, 175
 τέτυφα, 239, 293

τετυφοτ-, 156, 375
 τέτυφ(σ)θε, 372
 τετυφύα, 341
 τεύχω, 366, 424
 τέφρα, 424
 τέχνη, 283, 424
 τή, 108
 Τηθός, 135
 -τήρ, 239
 τιθασός, 181
 τιθείς, 4, 374 n., 375
 τίθεσαι, 346
 τίθημι, 2, 13, 37, 182, 186, 197, 276,
 401
 τιθήνη, 135, 181
 τίθησι, 346
 τιθός, 181
 τίλλειν, *ib.*
 τιμαγο(μι), 52
 τιμάω, 52, 258
 τир = τίς, 346
 τίς, 15, 406, 414, 415
 τίτραίνω, 46
 τίω, 414
 √τλα, 49, 430
 -το, 51 n.
 τοῖχος, 208
 τόξον, 111
 τόνος, 109
 -τορ, 140
 τόρνος, 46
 τού = σύ, 273
 τούν, *ib.*
 τούχα, 272
 τρανής, 47
 τράπεζα, 390
 √τραφ, 233 n., 237
 τράφω, 234, 236
 τράχω, 236
 τρέμω, 46
 τρέπω, 46, 232, 407
 √τρεφ, 233 n., 237
 τρέφω, 195, 233 n., 234, 425
 √τρεχ, 124 n.
 τρέω, 46
 τρηρός, *ib.*
 τρήρων, *ib.*
 √τριβ, 60
 τρίβω, 47, 60
 τριδουλος, 179
 τρισμέγιστος, *ib.*
 -τρον, 424
 τρόπαιον, 192
 √τροφ, 233 n., 237
 τροπή, *ib.*
 τρύπανον, 47

τρυνάω, 47
 τρύχω, 43
 τρύω, 46
 τρώμα, 32
 τύ, 392
 τυίδε, 279
 √τυκ, 424
 τύκος, 111, 366
 τύπτω, 345
 τύπ-τ-ω, 54
 τύς=τοῖς, 253
 τυφθεῖς, 261
 τύφω, 401
 τυχεῖν, 111
 -τώρ, 239, 278

Τ

ύβρίζω, 417
 ύβρις, 338
 ύγής, 203
 ύδωρ, 345, 426
 ύηνία, 244
 ύέ, *ib.*
 υῖός, 144, 256, 341
 -υκο-, 289
 ύλη, 20, 21
 ύμαλός, 279
 ύμεις, 342
 ύμμες, *ib.*
 ύμοιος, 279
 ύπά, 274
 ύπερφίλιος, 279
 ύπερφυής, *ib.*
 ύπήνη, 143
 ύπνος, 344, 370, 392
 ύπνῶν=ύπνόνεν, 260
 ύπό, 345, 426
 ύπόφαισις, 47 n.
 ύπόφαιτις, 47 n., 122
 ύσμίνη, 45, 342
 ύσ-τατο-, 53, 55
 ύστερος, 426

Φ

√φαγ, 124 n.
 φαεννός, 385
 √φαF, 47 n., 122, 341
 φαινόλης, 302
 φα-ί-ν-ω, 47, 54, 194
 φαισί, 251
 φάλαινα, 127
 φαμέν, 191
 φαμί, 47, 53
 √φαν, 180

φά-ναι, 358
 φανή, 48
 φάος, 47 n., 341 n.
 φαρέτρα, 139
 φάσις, 240
 φάσκω, 184
 √φεν, 47
 √φερ, 124 n.
 φέρ-ε-τε, 53
 φέρε(τ)ι, 372
 φέρετρον, 139
 φέριστος, 341 n.
 φέρ-α-μεν, 53, 286
 φέρ-οντα, 236
 φέρω, 230
 φεύγω, 167, 191, 202
 φήγος, 120
 φήμη, 47, 240
 φημί, 191, 341 n., 374, 374 n.
 φήρ, 380, 384
 φήριον, 384
 φησί, 392
 φθίνω, 201
 φθίσιμβροτος, *ib.*
 Φιδίαις, 253
 φιδιτής, 116
 φιδίτιον, *ib.*
 φιλομμειδής, 368
 φίλος, 201, 368
 φίλτατος=φίλτατος, 334
 φίτυς, 279
 φιτώ, 279, 402
 φοινίκιος, 276, 342
 φορβή, 360
 φορέοισι, 261
 φόρμιγξ, 365
 φόρος, 189, 230
 √φραγ, 334, 335
 φραγμός, 113
 φράδδω, 391
 √φρακ, 335
 φράζω, 335, 416
 φράσσω, 334, 335, 371
 φρατήρ, 140
 φρήν, 143
 φρίσσω=φρικ-γω, 54
 φροντίς, 143
 φροῦδος, 424
 φρουρός, 160
 Φρύγες, 20
 √φν, 60, 279, 402
 √φνγ, 191, 192, 202
 φυγd(δ)s, 420
 φύλον, 204
 φύρδην, 420
 φύσις, 204

φωνή, 240

φώς, 139

X

χαίρειν, 133

χαλκός, 250, 343

χαμα-, 132

χαμάζε, 133

χαμάθεν, *ib.*

χάμαι, 119, 133, 394

χαμόθεν, 133

χαρά, 315

χαρι-(F)εντ-, 57, 156

χαρίεσσα, 388

χάριτες, 133 n.

χάτις, 359

χειμών, 143, 171

χελύνη, 242 n.

χελώνη, *ib.*

χεύσω, 202

χεύω, 202, 348, 358

χέω, 202

χθαμαλός, 394

χθές, 275, 361, 381, 394, 421

χθιζός, 275

χθών, 394

χιτών, 5 n.

χίων, 361

χλόη, 133, 359

χλωρός, 133

χολή, 358

χορ-δή, 359

✓χρα, 240

χρήμα, *ib.*

χρίειν, 359

χρυσός, 133

✓χv, 202, 358

Ψ

ψεῦδος, 207

ψιθυρός, 279

ψιλόν, 384

ψύθος, 279

Ω

ᾠβρα, 348

ᾠθ-έ-ω, 54

ᾠκυ-, 103, 235, 239

ᾠλαφος, 260

ᾠλένη, 233

ᾠμοιν, 372

ᾠμος, 233

ᾠνήρ, 260

ᾠνούμηνεν, 273

ᾠπολος, 260

ᾠρα, 123, 145, 148

ᾠρα, 145, 160

ᾠρύω, 203

ᾠς, 150

ᾠς, 51 n., 150, 342, 344

III. LATIN INDEX.

A.

-ā (fem. nom.), 327
 ab, 4 n., 115
 abdere, 38 n., 48, 136, 136 n.
 abei, 265 n.
 abietis, 311
 abnuont, 286
 abolere, 159
 abs, 317
 abstineo, 435
 accuso (causa), 269
 acer, 193
 Acheruntem, 286
 Acherun(ti)s, 302
 Acherunsius, 400
 acies, 103, 193, 235
 Aciles, 20
 actus, 128, 397
 acu-o, 53, 103, 235
 acu-s, 103, 235
 ad, 4 n.
 adbitere, 340
 ad-fatim, 359
 adfictāt, 304 n.
 adicio, 311
 ad-ol-esco, 159, 302
 adsecla, 196
 aduena(s), 352
 adultus, 302
 aecum, 310
 aedes, 38 n., 200, 200 n., 263, 359
 aeger, 201
 aeg(e)ri, 317
 aegrotus, 201
 aemulus, *ib.*
 aequiperare, 292
 aequom, 310
 aerumna, 302
 aes, 262 n.
 Aesculapius, 283, 433
 aestas, 170, 200
 aestus, 200
 aeuom, 201, 347

√ag, 128, 291, 292, 312
 ag(e)ri, 317
 ager(os), 328
 agnitus, 292
 ago, 193, 197, 295
 aides, aidilis, 262
 Aimilius, 263
 aio, 351
 aikuom, 263
 √ak, 193
 alacris, 289
 Albinus, 359
 Albins, *ib.*
 Alcumena, 283, 433
 Alexander, 322 n.
 Alfidius, 420
 Alfius, 359
 alieubi, 51 n., 371
 ali(c)unde, 371
 ali-enus, 311
 -alis, 402
 al(i)tus, 317
 altare, 240
 alt(o)rix, 315
 altus, 397
 alum(i)nus, 317
 alumnus, 234, 286, 302
 amabare, 4 n.
 amabaris, *ib.*
 amaberis, *ib.*
 amare, *ib.*
 amareis, *ib.*
 amās, 324
 amasius, 400
 amasso, 319
 amāt, 324
 ama(ue)ram, 336
 amauero, 319
 am(aya)o, 52
 ambages, 193, 292
 ambo, 235, 359
 amittebat, 322, 324
 amnis, 396
 amo, 52, 371

amor, 354
 angor, 134, 361
 anguis, 134, 234, 361
 angustus, 84, 134, 142
 anhelio, 292, 331
 Anienis, 311
 animae, 331
 animai, *ib.*
 animal(e), *ib.*
 animal(i), 329
 animus, 142
 -antio, 400
 Antioco, 382
 anxius, 134
 aper, 371
 aplustre, 286
 apud, 337
 aput, *ib.*
 aqua, 405
 aquai, 268
 Aquil(l)ius, 301
 ara = asa, 240, 353
 aranea, 373
 arare, 34, 158
 arāt, 325
 arbiter, 340
 arbor, 354
 arboris, *ib.*
 arbos, 283
 arbuscula, 286
 arbustum, 286, 308
 arceo, 431
 arcesso, 340
 arcitenens, 289
 arfuerunt, 339
 arfuisse, *ib.*
 -aris, 402
 armi-ger, 289
 Arpinas, 328
 artus, 397
 aruorsum, 339
 ascendo, 291
 asinus, 235
 aspergo, 291
 aspernor, 114
 aspero-, 282
 astitit, 325
 auceps, 291
 audac(i)ter, 317
 audio, 154
 audi(ui)t, 298
 aud-i(ya)-o, 52
 augeāt, 325
 augeo, 203
 au(i)deo, 317
 auis, 233

au(i)spex, 320
 aula, 268
 aurea, 259
 Aurelius, 152
 aureolus, 308
 aurichalcum, 269
 Aurora, 153, 153 n., 203
 ausculor, 269
 auscultare, *ib.*
 au(si)sim, 318
 Auster, 152

B.

Bacanal, 382
 badisso, 20, 354
 balatro, 413
 balaena, 126
 balineum, 282
 balo, 126
 -bam, 129
 barba, 360
 Barbati (gen. sing.), 267, 283
 bellum, 371, 415
 belua, 301
 bene, 308, 326
 bene-uolus, 290
 beni-uolus, *ib.*
 -ber, 303
 -bero, 316
 bibere (= uiuere), 357
 bibo, 188, 338
 biduum, 122
 biennium, 291
 bi(go)nae, 320
 bis, 371, 415
 blatero, 433
 -bo, -bis (fut.), 27, 55
 Boblicola, 188
 bonos, 352
 bonus, 415
 bos, 119, 233
 bre(gh)uis, 362, 373, 410
 breuis, 127, 410
 br(e)u(i)ma, 317
 breuitat-, 240
 Bruges, 20
 Brundisium, 400
 bubile, 349, 357
 bubus, 300
 bucina, 127
 bucca, *ib.*
 bulbus, 302
 Burrus, 271
 -bus, 27, 325

C.

cadamitas, 339
 Caecilius, 308
 caecus, 201
 caedo, *ib.*
 caelum, 370
 Caius, 336
 c(a)lam, 197
 calamitas, 339
 cal(i)duus, 317
 caligo, 197, 292
 calim, 308
 calx(-ic-), 317
 Campanus, 328
 ✓can, 291
 canis, 407
 canistrum, 305
 Canusium, 400
 ✓cap, 291, 303
 cap(e)ri, 316
 cap-i-o, 54
 carcer, 176
 cardinis, 305, 312
 carmen, 353
 carniuor, 180
 carnufex, 300
 Carpasus, 338
 Cartago, 333
 Carthago, 21 n.
 casa, 370
 Casmenae, 353, 373
 ca(s)nus, 373
 cassus, 396
 cast-i-monia, 289
 castreis = castro-is, 266
 castrum, 10, 117
 catapult, 282
 cauea, 203
 caueo, 193
 caui, *ib.*
 caulae, 203
 cauos, 203, 370
 caupo, 204
 causi-dicus, 289
 caussa, 21, 353
 cecidi, 293
 Cecilius, 263
 celare, 197
 celer-is, 289
 celerrimus, 395
 celsus, 397
 ce(n)sor, 216, 373
 cepet, 265
 -ceps (cap), 303
 -cer, *ib.*

cere-brum, 105
 cer(e)ritus, 331
 cervix, 105
 ceruos, 106, 284, 356
 ce(s)na, 373, 395
 Cethegus, 21 n.
 chorda, 20
 ✓ci, 104
 cieo, 105
 cilium, 197
 cincinnus, 176, 181
 cineris, 303
 cio, 105
 -cio, 412
 cito, 327
 citus, 105
 ciuis, 104
 ciuitas, *ib.*
 ciui-tat-, 109
 (c)lamentum, 301
 clamor, 283, 315, 331, 370
 clarus, 315, 331
 Claudius, 268
 claustrum, 401
 cliuos, 201
 Clodius, 263
 cludo, 269
 Clusius, *ib.*
 Cnaeus, 336
 cnata, *ib.*
 -co, 289
 ✓coc, 12, 390
 cochlear(i), 329
 cocus, 12, 406
 coerator, 267
 cognitus, 292, 331
 co-go, 292, 320
 co(i)mo, 320
 coirauit, 199
 c(o)uncti, 320
 colere, 408
 collega, 197
 colligo, 292
 colonus, 408
 columba, 302, 408
 columna, 234, 286, 302
 comissor, 305
 con, 277
 condemno, 291
 condere, 38 n., 48, 136
 condicio, 389, 398
 condo, 48, 359
 conficere, 293
 confinia, 368
 coniux, 148
 consilium, (sul), 308

eo(n)sol, 300, 373
 consul, 216, 352 n.
 contactum, 293
 conticiscam, 305
 contingo, 291
 contio, 56, 323, 398
 contionabundo-, 56
 contubernium, 291
 conubium, 351
 conuicium, 398
 copa, 204
 copia, 424
 coquina, 12, 408
 coquo, 15, 406
 cord-, 106, 235, 371
 Corintus, 383
 Cornelio(s), 377
 corniger, 289
 cornu, 106
 corolla, 316
 corporis, 283, 303
 corporus (gen.), 283
 corpu(s)lentus, 373
 cosentiont, 286
 cosol, 352 n.
 cōturnix, 419 n.
 co-uen-ti-on-, 56
 crapula, 282
 crastini (loc.), 266
 cras-tino-, 53
 creare, 353
 credē (base), 289
 cred-i-bilis, *ib.*
 credon(e), 330
 crepā (base), 315
 crimen, 201
 crista, 105
 cuba (base), 289, 315
 cub(a)ui, 315
 (c)ubi, 51 n., 371
 cub-i-culum, 289
 cubitum, 315
 cubui, *ib.*
 cuculus, 175
 cucumis, 176
 cucurri, 293
 culmen, 302
 -culo-, 409
 culter, 370
 cultus, 302, 397
 cum, 310, 409
 (c)unde, 371
 cunctor, 402
 cunctus, 320, 352
 cupio, 204
 cupressus, 315

curabeis, 265 n.
 curculio, 336
 cur-r-o, 54
 cursor, 397
 cursus, *ib.*
 (c)uti, 371
 cutis, 370

D.

√da, 122, 294
 dacruma=lacruma, 339
 damno, 291
 dare, 235
 dari, 328
 datai, 262
 dator, 50, 56, 278
 datorem, 239
 daturus, 278
 dearum, 353
 deb(e)ui, 317
 decem, 232, 237, 288, 399
 declino, 201
 de(c)nus, 373
 dede (dedit), 379
 dedere, *ib.*
 dederimus, 331
 dederi, 287
 dederont, 286
 dederunt, 303, 331
 dedet, 265
 dedi, 294, 328
 dedimus, 331
 dedo, 359
 dedro(nt), 287, 379
 dedrot, 287, 331
 defrudo (fraud), 269
 de(hi)beo, 331
 deicerent, 264
 deico, 199, 264
 deiero, 292
 deiuos, 199, 264
 delinire, 292
 -dem, 352 n., 418
 Demipho, 290
 den(t)s, 430
 deripio, 291
 de-rupio, *ib.*
 detrecto, *ib.*
 de(u)os, 355
 deus, 37, 37 n., 122
 dextera, 277, 322
 dextro-, 317
 (d)ianua, 371
 (D)ianus, 371
 √dic, 199
 dic(e), 329, 399

dicebam, 237
 dicio, 398
 dico, 199
 dicundo, 286
 didici, 294
 diduco, 373
 die (gen.), 155
 dies, 122
 die(s)i, 355
 Diespiter, 291
 difficilis, 293, 308, 309
 Diis, Dis, 311
 (D)ionis, 371
 discip(u)lina, 316, 331
 discipulus, 409
 disco, 373
 displicet, 293, 308, 410
 dissilio, 291
 diu, 418
 diuissus, 396
 diurnus, 287, 308
 dixē (inf.), 318
 dixti, 318, 331
 do, 3, 50, 136
 -do, 418
 doceam, 259
 docēo, 206 n.
 doc(e)ui, 317
 domi, 328
 dom-i-bus, 289
 domo, 237
 domum, 88
 domus, 37, 125, 235
 donum, 50, 122, 239
 do(t)s, 122
 douco, 60, 203, 206
 drachuma, 283, 433
 dubius, 415
 √duc, 60
 duellatores, 415
 duellum, 371, 415
 duis, 371
 dum, 352 n., 418
 dumetum, 317
 duonoro(m), 283
 duonus, 415
 duplex, *ib.*
 dupundi, 286, 302
 durissimus, 395
 duriti $\begin{cases} \text{es} \\ \text{a} \end{cases}$, 307
 dux, 53

E.

ecus, 310, 355, 409
 √ed, 432

edi, 197
 ēdo, *ib.*
 egenus, 234
 egeo, 134
 egi, 197, 295
 ego, 51 n., 327
 eire, 199, 264
 eis, 266
 eius, 351
 -ello, 316
 -en, 288
 endo, 306
 epistula, 282, 327 n.
 equester, 396, 401
 equestris, 289
 equites, 410
 equos, 108, 235, 275, 310, 355, 405
 eram, 13, 198 n., 353
 erciscundae, 286
 ergo, 327
 -eris, 303
 -ero, 316, 350, 353
 √es, 140, 432
 -es, (it), 303
 -es, 318
 -es (ē), 305
 esse (√ed), 395
 (e)sumus, 433
 (e)sum(i), *ib.*
 e(sunt)i, *ib.*
 est (ed.), 317, 401
 euntem, 236, 304
 ex, 318
 -ex (ic), 313
 exaestumo, 264
 exa(g)men, 373
 expando, 293
 expertus, 397
 explodo (plaud), 269
 exta, 148
 extempulo, 316
 exterus, 148
 extinx(is)em, 318
 extra, 148

F.

faba, 360
 fab(e)rica, 331
 Fabius, 357
 √fac, 318 n.
 fac(e), 329
 facilis, (cul), 308
 facit, 325
 faedus (haedus), 359
 fagus, 120

Falesii (Falerii), 400
 fallo, 114, 369
 falsus, 396, 397
 fames, 359
 familiae, 378
 familiās, 262 n., 378
 famul(os), 328
 far, 139
 farcio, 334, 335, 371
 far(c)tus, 373
 fari, 358
 fariolus, 359
 farrago, 292
 fasena, 363
 √fat, 291
 fatidicus, 289
 fatigo, 359
 faxim, 318
 faxo, 318
 √fe, 295
 fecerim, 319
 fēci, 295
 fe(fa)ci, 219 n.
 f(ef)ac(i)so, 318
 fefelli, 294, 381
 feido, 60, 199
 fel, 358, 377
 felo, 135
 femina, 135, 234, 341 n.
 feneris, 303
 fenestra, 435
 fenus, 341 n.
 √fer, 432
 fera, 245, 380
 ferax, 189
 ferbui, 349, 357, 402
 ferebam, 1
 ferendum, 286
 ferentarium, 322
 ferentem, 236, 286, 304
 Ferentia, 358
 Ferentinum, *ib.*
 ferimus, 286, 300, 433
 fer(i)t, 318
 ferrem, 395
 fers, 318
 fertilis, 189
 ferunt, 286, 377, 433
 feruor, 359
 √fes, 37
 festus, *ib.*
 fetalis, 398
 √fid, 60, 199
 fidēi, 331
 fides, 114, 199, 200, 369
 fido, 60, 199

fidus, 199, 200
 figit, 325
 fileai, 307
 filiolus, 308
 filios (nom.), 259
 filius, 135
 filum, 395
 findo, 173, 216
 finis, 28, 395
 firmus, 358
 fissus, 396, 397
 fixus, *ib.*
 flamen, 371
 flamma, 28, 395
 flecto, 54
 fle(u)o, 202
 flucti-uagus, 289
 fluere, 270
 flumen, 202
 √fluv, 355
 fluant, *ib.*
 fluuios, 203, 270
 fluxus, 397
 fōdi, 197
 fod-i-o, 54, 197
 foedere, 267
 foedus, 199, 200
 folus, 359
 fordeum, *ib.*
 fores, 358
 forma, *ib.*
 Formiae, *ib.*
 formido, *ib.*
 formonsus, 352 n.
 formus, 14, 358
 fors, 139
 fortis, 18
 fortuna, 139
 forum, 358
 fortis, 359
 Fouius (= Fabius), 357
 fractum, 218, 223
 fractus, 13, 223
 √frag, 13, 291
 fragilis, 193
 fragor, 13
 frango, 197, 218, 291, 369
 fratribus, 27
 fregi, 197, 218
 fremere, 365
 friare, 359
 friuolus, 311, 359
 fron(t)i)s, 328
 fructu-osus, 156
 frudaui, 269
 frugifer(os), 331

frundes, 302
 fruor, 410
 frustra, 269
 √fu, 60, 135, 199, 358
 fuāt, 325
 fuet, 265
 √fug, 192
 fugio, 167, 358
 fui, 129, 315, 358
 fuit, 265
 fulget, 325 n.
 fulgor, 301
 fultus, 373
 fuluos, 301
 fumus, 137, 204, 358
 funda, 114, 369
 Fundanius, 382
 fungus, 114
 funebris, 289
 funus, 204
 furfur, 176
 Furie, 263
 Furio(s), 377
 fustis, 286
 futare, 358
 futire, *ib.*

G.

Gaius, 375
 garrire, 44
 gau(i)deo, 317, 331
 gauisus, 317
 gener, 433
 generis = genesis, 236, 283, 303
 genua, 356
 genu, 119
 genus, 49, 236, 283
 gero, 353
 gesistei, 265
 gi-g-n-o, 188
 giluos, 133
 √glab, 46
 glaber, 46, 338
 gloria, 335
 glutire, 180
 √gnā, 117
 gnaiuod, 378
 gnarus, 117
 gno-sco, 49, 54, 117
 grac-i-lis, 83, 289
 gramen, 344, 361
 grando, 361
 granum, *ib.*
 gratus, 133, 315

grauis, 126, 411
 guberno, 336
 gula, 180
 gurgulio, 180, 336
 gynaeceum, 253

H.

haba, 360
 hab(e)ui, 317
 haec ce, 329
 haedus, 359
 Hannibal, 325
 hanser, 360
 harena, 360
 hariolus, 339
 (h)aruspex, 428
 haud, 337, 378
 haurio, 353
 haustus, 396
 haut, 337
 Hecuba, 282, 300
 heluos, 133
 herba, 360
 Hercoles, 282
 Hercolus, *ib.*
 here(d)s, 377
 herei (loc.), 266, 361, 394
 hic(e), 51 n., 266, 329, 399
 hiemps, 13, 143, 361, 377, 435
 hilar-is, 289
 hisce (nom. pl.), 329, 378
 ho(d)c(e), 51 n.
 hodiernus, 287
 Hoelas = Hylas, 267
 ho(i)ornus, 320
 holera, 133, 349, 360
 holus, 359, 360
 homo, 133, 156, 327
 hominis, 305, 331
 homullus, 302, 316
 homunculus, 286
 honestus, 302
 honos, 283
 hordeus, 359
 Hortensius, 400
 hortus, 354
 hospes, 361
 hosticapas, 302, 352
 hostis, 359, 361
 humus, 133, 394
 hunc, 286, 303, 377

I.

√i, 199
 √iac, 311

iac-i-o, 54
 iam, 51 n.
 iantrices, 148
 Janus-pater, 293
 ico, 407
 ictus, 390
 -icus, 306
 id, 51 n.
 -ido-, 306
 iecur, 245, 342, 407
 ieis, 312
 ignis, 306, 339
 ignobilis, 118
 ille, 287
 illecebrae (lic), 308
 illic(e), 330
 illico, 292
 illius, 312, 331
 -illo-, 316
 illuies, 311
 imago, 182, 292
 imbecillus, 297
 imitor, 182, 201
 immanis, 240
 impetus, 358
 impingo, 295
 inceideretis, 264
 incestus, 291
 incola, 408
 indigeo, 134
 indu, 306
 indu(i)tiae, 320, 398
 inermis, 331
 infelix, 216
 inf(e)ra, 316
 infernē, 326
 inficio, 358
 infimo, 55
 infringo, 291
 inimicus, *ib.*
 in-iquos, 264
 iniustus, 351
 inquam, 1
 inquilinus, 308, 408
 inquirō, 264, 331
 insanus, 216
 insece, 407
 inspicio, 308
 insulsus, 291
 in-sul-to, *ib.*
 Interamna, 406
 intus, 306
 -inus, 305
 ioubeatīs, 270
 ioudex, 203, 270
 iouranto, 270

ious, 203
 Iphigenia, 253
 ipse, 51 n., 287, 322
 ipsius, 312
 ire, 199
 -isco(e), 305
 is ea id, 50, 51 n., 149
 i(s)dem, 373
 iste (is(e)te), 51 n.
 ita, 51 n., 326
 -itat-, 306, 312
 iter, 199
 -itia, 306
 -it-ion-, 199
 -itudin-, *ib.*
 -ītus(a), *ib.*
 -ītus(ē), *ib.*
 iunctum, 218
 Iuppiter, 123, 291, 292
 iubē, 328
 iubeo, 270
 iudex, 373
 iugerum, 148
 iugum, 45, 148, 351, 418
 iungo, 218
 iunxi, *ib.*
 iur(i)gium, 312, 317, 320, 331
 iuris-consultus, 35 n.
 ius, 351, 417
 -ius (compar.), 306
 iussus, 396
 iuuenis, 125
 iuxta, 148, 318

K.

K(alendae), 336
 K(aeso), *ib.*

L.

Labici, 357
 labor, 139
 lacer, 368, 370
 lacerna, 368
 lacero, 193
 lacruma, 20
 lac(t), 377
 lac(ti), 321
 lacunar(i), *ib.*
 lacubus, 399
 laesus, 396
 laetus, 201, 371
 laevos, *ib.*
 lamentum, 370
 lanx, 371

lapillus, 395
 lapsus, 396, 397
 Larcus, 398
 Lares, 353
 Lartius, 398
 lasciuos, 161
 Lases, 353
 lateb(e)ra, 316
 lateralis, 402
 latus, 370, 371
 lauere, 235, 371
 Lauerna, 162
 Lauci, 357
 Laurentum, 400
 laus, (clu), 370
 lautus, 203, 268
 lectiones, 336
 legimus, 376
 legitur, 27
 lægo, 197, 292
 leber = liber, 264
 leiber, 199, 264
 leites, 199
 Lemniseleme, 290
 Leucesie, 203
 leuigare, 312
 leuir, 124, 338
 leuis, 234, 373, 411, 423
 lex, 197
 liber, 199
 lib(e)ri, 316, 331
 libero, 282
 libet, 164
 licet, 406
 lignum, 339
 ligurio, 361
 limus, 369, 373
 lingua, 306, 339
 li-no, 53
 linquo, 406
 lis, 370
 lites, 13, 199
 lixus, 397
 loeuntur, 409
 loeus, 301, 370
 loebertas, 199
 loqnâr, 325
 loquuntur, 286
 locus, 268
 Loucana, 270
 Loucânia, 203
 Loucina, *ib.*
 lubet, 161, 359
 √luc, 157
 luceo, *ib.*
 Lucilius, 308

Luciom, 284
 luciscit, 306
 Lucius, 203, 255, 270 n., 284
 Lucullus, 308
 lucrum, 162
 lucuna, 308
 ludibrium, 289
 lugubris, 202
 lugeo, *ib.*
 lumen, 373
 luna, 124, 373
 lunā (nom.), 327 n.
 lupus, 370, 408
 luteolus, 308
 lutum, 134
 lyra, 19, 20

M.

√mac, 193
 macer, *ib.*
 macero, *ib.*
 machina, 282
 macister, 336
 maestus, 201
 mage, 377
 magis, 306
 magistreis (nom.), 378
 magi(u)s, 318
 magnus, 234, 396
 maior, 150, 373
 malē, 326
 male-ficus, 290
 mali-ficus, *ib.*
 malig(e)nus, 320
 mali-volus, 290
 mancipium, 291
 mănē, 328
 manere, 144, 145, 196, 234
 manipulus, 409 n.
 mansum, 397, 398
 mantare, 398
 mănū, 322
 man(u)ceps, 320
 man(u)datu, *ib.*
 manus, 240
 mănus, *ib.*
 manūs, 323
 man(u)suetus, 320
 mare, 287, 355
 mare (gen.), 288
 marginis, 305
 mari, 287
 mari(d) (abl.), *ib.*
 med, 326, 418

medeor, 146
 medicus, *ib.*
 meditor, *ib.*
 medius, 359
 mei, mihi, 50, 51 n., 308
 meminī, 196
 memor, 180, 181, 369
 memoria, 146, 180
 mendax, 145
 Menerva, 305
 mens, 196, 302
 mensa, 182
 mensarum, 354
 mensura, 182
 mentio, 145
 mentiri, *ib.*
 men(t)is, 328
 mereo, 146
 merētod, 306
 meridies, 340
 meritus(ē), 306
 mertare, 398
 merx, 146
 meta, 240
 metior, 182
 meus, 308
 mihi, 308, 328, 360
 miles, 373
 mina, 283, 433
 min(i)or, 352
 minus, 306
 Mirquirios, 409
 mirus, 369
 misceo, 335
 miser, 201
 miser(i)us, 317
 Mithridates, 290
 mit-t-o, 54
 moderor, 146
 modo, 327
 modus, 146, 240, 327
 moenera, 199
 mola, 277, 349
 mollis, 235, 396
 momentum, 288
 momordi, 293
 mon-e(ya)-o, 52, 145, 196, 206 n.
 monstrum, 145, 435
 monuere, 287
 monueront, *ib.*
 monuerunt, *ib.*
 √mor, 146, 180
 mora, 145
 morior, 237
 mortalis, 402
 mos, 240

√mov, 318
 moueo, 197
 moui, *ib.*
 mug-i-o, 54, 335
 mulgeo, 302
 mul(g)si, 373
 mul(g)sus, 397
 muliebr-is, 289
 muris, 353
 murmur, 176, 180
 murus, 203
 -mus, 2
 musa, 254
 myrrha, 369 n.

N.

narrare, 117, 371
 nascor, 184
 nau(i)fragus, 320
 nauim, 288
 nauis, 203
 ne, 51 n.
 nebula, 139
 √nec, 292
 nec, 329
 necā (base), 317
 neca(u)i, *ib.*
 nepotes, 337
 nequidem, 409
 neque, 329
 Nerius, 144
 Nero, *ib.*
 neruos, 369
 neu(e), 270, 329, 329 n.
 ne-uter, 270
 neutiquam, *ib.*
 neutro, 317
 nex, 110, 196
 nidus, 275
 nig(e)ri, 317, 419 n.
 niger, 419 n.
 nihil (nehil), 308
 ningit, 361
 ningo, 143
 ninguo, 362
 nisi, 328
 nitor, 371
 nix, 369
 noceo, 110, 196, 206 n.
 noct-, 277
 nomen, 57, 117, 288, 371
 nondinum, 270
 nontiatu, *ib.*
 nos, 51 n.

nostra(ti)s, 330
 nostro, 317
 notus, 371
 nouem, 288
 no(ue)ram, 331, 355
 no(ue)runt, 355
 noundinum, 270
 nountios, 270, 398
 nouos, 236, 355
 nox, 110, 167, 275 n., 330 n.
 nubes, 139, 359
 nubo, 204
 nudius, 122
 num, 51 n.
 nuncupo, 320
 nundinum, 270
 nuntius, 270, 302, 320, 398
 nurus, 143, 369
 nutus, 202

O.

ob, 115
 obex, 351
 obicio, 311, 351
 obicit, 311 n.
 obiurgare, 312
 obsecro, 291
 ocellus, 316
 oceppso, 318
 oc-cido, 264
 oc-cul-o, 191, 308
 occupo, 291, 303
 ocior, 235
 oc-ius, 103
 octo, 233, 235
 oculus, 235, 390, 407
 odor, 235, 339
 oenus (unus), 267
 officina, 320
 oinus (unus), 199, 267
 oitile (utile), 199
 ol(e)facio, 320, 339
 olere, 339
 olla, 268
 -ollo, 316
 -olus, 311
 -onsus, 157
 operis, 303
 opifex, 331
 opilio, 407
 opimus, 235
 opiparus, 35 n.
 opos, 283
 opprimar, 325

ops, 424
 optumo-, 53, 55
 oquoltod, 409
 √or, 159
 orb(i)s, 329
 orbus, 359
 orior, 159, 235
 -oris, 303
 os, 235, 377
 oscillum, 316
 osculor, 269
 ostendo, 435
 -osus, 156
 otium, 398
 oua, 348
 ouis, 233, 235

P.

√pa, 188
 pāc-, 193
 pāciscor, 167, 193, 197, 335
 paedor, 203
 paenitet, *ib.*
 paenula, 302
 pagus, 335
 palea, 114
 Palilia, 402
 palma, 315, 331
 palumbes, 408
 pango, 197
 panna, 370
 papauer, 176
 √par, 295
 parcus, 370
 parentes, 113
 paricidas, 352
 pario, 113
 parra, 370
 pars, 113, 236
 partem, 288
 partim, *ib.*
 pasco, 184, 218
 passus, 396, 397
 pate (base), 289
 pater, 56
 pat(e)ris, 236, 317
 pat-i-bulum, 288
 patrē, 326
 patred, 378
 patrem, 375
 patricius, 398
 patris, 236
 pau(c)i-per, 320
 pauimentum, 203

panire, *ib.*
 paulum, 301
 pecten, 288
 pec-t-o, 54
 pecu, 232
 pedestris, 329
 pedester, 303
 pedester(is), 329
 pedis, 237
 pegi, 196
 peiero, 292, 331, 373
 √pel, 297
 pel-l-o, 54, 302
 pendeo, 302
 penna, 395, 396
 penuria, 370
 peperci, 294
 peperi, 295
 pepigi, 294, 295
 pequnia, 409
 perculsus, 302
 peregrinus, 291
 perfacilis, 293, 308
 periculum, 112
 pe(r)iero, 373
 perirēt, 325
 peritus, 112
 periurus, 292
 pernicies, *ib.*
 perpetior, *ib.*
 perplacet, 293
 pertaesus, 264
 pertinax, 292
 pessulus, 302
 petii, 292, 311
 petorritum, 408
 phalerae, 282
 Philippum, 332 n.
 philosophia, 20
 picus, 199
 pietatis, 312
 pig(e)ri, 317
 pigneris, 303
 pignus, 306
 pila, 114
 Pilipus, 382
 pilumnoe (nom. pl.), 267
 pinguis, 219, 306, 410
 pinus, 373
 piper(i), 329
 piscis, 116
 pist(o)rina, 315, 331
 pituita, 373
 placare, 193
 placere, *ib.*
 (p)laetus, 371

√plāg, 193
 plāga, *ib.*
 Platea, 253, 331
 plastrum, 268
 Plautus, *ib.*
 √ple, 393, 409 n.
 plebeius, 351
 plebe(s)i, 355
 plebs, 113, 393
 plenus, 113
 ploera, 267
 ploirume (nom. pl.), 266, 267, 268
 pl(o)us, 352
 plostrum, 268, 269
 Plotus, *ib.*
 plous, 270
 plurimus, 353
 poculum, 188, 315
 poena, 202, 203
 Poenicas, 266
 pomorium, 267
 pono, 327 n.
 popina, 12, 408
 Poplicola, 188
 poplicus, 270
 poplo-, 289
 poploe (nom. pl.), 267
 poposci, 293
 popularis, 402
 pop(u)licus, 331
 pōpulus, 181
 pop(u)lus, 316, 393
 Porsen(n)a, 305
 porta, 112
 portio, 236
 portus, 112
 -pos, 278
 pos(i)tus, 317
 po(s)moerium, 373
 po(s)no, *ib.*
 posse, 320
 posthabere, 292
 post(i), 329
 postridie, 327
 Postume, 288
 pote, 377
 potus, 188, 239
 prae (in comp.), 264
 praehendo, 320
 prae(hi)da, 263
 prae(i)tor, 320
 praesens, 263
 prae-s-to, 318
 prae-stol-or, 110
 precari, 196
 preimos (= primus), 264

prendo, 320
 pressus, 396, 397
 pretor (= praetor), 263
 pridie, 264
 pri-mo, 55, 264
 principium, 351
 prius-tus, 264
 priuignus, *ib.*
 probaueront, 286
 Procilius, 308
 Proculus, *ib.*
 procus, 196
 prodigium, 291
 profiteor, *ib.*
 prohibeo, 291, 292
 prohibessis, 319
 prohibueris, *ib.*
 proiecere, 311
 pronuba, 204
 pro(uor)sa, 320
 publiceis (nom.), 378
 publicus, 209
 pude (base), 288
 pud-i-bundus, *ib.*
 puér(i)tia, 331
 puer(os), 328
 pulcher, 21
 -pulo-, 409
 pulsus, 279, 302, 397
 pultare, 398
 pulueris, 303
 puluis, 114, 302
 punctum, 218
 pungo, *ib.*
 punio, 203
 pupillus, 316
 pupugi, 203, 293
 pur(i)gare, 312, 317, 331
 purus, 203
 pus, *ib.*
 pusillus, 419 n.
 pusus, *ib.*
 putere, 203
 puto, 202
 putris, 203
 putus, 202

Q.

quis, 409
 quadraginta, 337
 quaero, 353
 quaes(i)tor, 331
 quaeso, 353
 quaestor, 409
 quar-to, 55

quasi, 328
 quattuor, 107, 337, 413, 414
 que, 74, 149, 326
 queam, 307
 querella, 21, 301, 409
 ques (nom. pl.), 266
 ✓qui, 104
 quid, 326
 quidem, 322
 quies, 108, 108 n., 406
 quin(e), 329
 quinque, 15, 275, 407
 quin[que]decim, 320
 quintidie, 327
 quis, 15, 176
 quisquiliae, 176
 quisquis, *ib.*
 quo, 107
 quod, 51
 quoi, quei = qui, 266
 quom, 310
 quot, 329 n.
 quotie(n)s, 373
 quo(u)rsum, 320

R.

racemus, 371
 radix, 370
 raptim, 288
 ratis, 158
 ratiuncula, 302
 raucus, 203
 Reate, 369
 rec(e)cidi, 320
 recino, 291
 regebam(i), 329
 reg-i-men, 289
 regis(i), 329
 regit(i), *ib.*
 rego, 431
 regont(i), 329
 reg(y)am, 307
 reice, 311 n.
 relicuos, 355
 relligio, 301
 reminiscor, 145
 remus, 151, 373
 repos(i)tus, 317, 320
 ret(e)tuli, 320, 331
 reticeo, 291
 réttulit, 294
 ridet, 325
 riuos, 369
 robigo, 292
 rogā, 328

Roma, 369
ros, 370
rube (base), 289
ruber, 129, 134, 204, 359, 433
rub-i-cundus, 289, 306
ructo, 430
ruere, 371
rufus, 129, 134, 204, 359
√rug, 430
rug-i-o, 54
rumpo, 162
ruont, 286
√rup, 162
rupes, 204
Rūpilius, *ib.*
ru(r)sum, 373
rutilus, 134
rutundus, 308

S.

sa, 51 n.
√sa, 181
Sabinae, 263
Sabinus, 359
sacrificus, 300
saepes, 408
sagax, 193
sagus, *ib.*
√sal, 291
sal, 161
sal(e), 329
salic(e)tum, 317
salsus, 291
salum, 161
Samnium, 396
sanct-i-monia, 289
sapio, 424
sar(c)tus, 373
satis, 306, 318
sati(u)s, 318
satum, 188
Saturnus, 197
satus, *ib.*
scabere, 236
Scabillum, 338
Scaeuola, 311
scaeuos, 201
scala, 395
√scalp, 46
scalpo, *ib.*
scamnum, 396
scapus, 240
scelestus, 303
√scid, 217
scindo, 217, 335, 424

scipio, 240, 275
sciscidi, 294
-sco, 184
scobs, 236
scopae, 240
scopio, *ib.*
scopus, *ib.*
screiptus, 264
scribere, 359
scrobs, *ib.*
scrofa, *ib.*
√sec, 223
se(c)tius, 398
secundus, 55, 286, 406
secuntur, 318
secuta, 407
sē, sēd, 326, 337
sedeo, 197
sedes, 232, 334
segmentum, 223, 396
se(i)ungo, 373
sella, 355 n., 395
senatuos (gen.), 283
senectūti, 322
senex, 322 n., 323 n.
septem, 237, 288
sept(em)ussis, 320
sepultus, 302, 397
septimeī (loc.), 266
sequontur, 310
sequor, 55, 196, 406
series, 161, 197
sero, 188
serra, 395
seruasso, 319
serum, 161
seruos, 284
sērus, 197
seruus, 284
set, sed, 337
seu, seue, 270
sibi, 355
sic(e) 51 n.
Siculus, 302
sideris, 303
sido, 275
siem, 55, 307
sigillum, 317
signum, 306, 317
silua, 20
sim, 55
similis (simul), 308
simillimae, 322 n.
simpulus, 409
sinciput, 320
sin(e), 329

sinistro, 317
 -sio, 318
 si-st-o, 188, 293
 sitim, 288
 siue, 329 n.
 -so, 318 n.
 soboles (suboles), 308.
 socer, 370
 socius, 196
 socordia (secordia), 308
 sol, 344
 solacium, 398
 sollennis, 292, 301, 395
 sollers, 395
 solli-citus, 105, 395
 sollifides, 395
 sollus, *ib.*
 soluo, 162, 308, 356
 somnus, 344, 396
 sona, 354
 sonere, 315
 sōnus, 197
 sōpio, *ib.*
 sopor, 197, 370
 sorōr, 323, 325, 370
 sos, 51 n.
 so(u)os (suus), 270 n., 355
 sparsus, 373, 397
 √spec, 5 n., 199, 308
 specā = spica, 264
 speci-men, 289
 sper-no, 53, 114
 sportula, 277
 spuere, 370
 spurius, 114
 squama, 395
 √sta, 188
 stabulum, 110
 stamen, 288
 statim, *ib.*
 stella, 36, 167, 316
 ster-i-lis, 289
 sterula, 36
 steti, 294
 sti(g)mulus, 373
 stilla, 316
 stinguo, 334
 stipare, 110
 sti(pi)pendium, 320
 stius, 110
 stlatus, 370
 stlites, 13
 -sto (superl.), 318
 studium, 202
 stultiōr, 325
 stultus, 302

stupere, 111
 stupor, *ib.*
 sua(d)si, 373
 sua(d)uis, 193, 373, 395
 sub, 4 n.
 sublim-is, 289
 suboles, 159
 subs, 318
 subtilis, 292
 succus, 407
 suffoco (fauc-), 269
 suffragium, 193
 sulcus, 302
 sum, 1
 summus, 317, 395
 sum-p-tum, 435
 suo, 151
 superbus, 279
 super-cilium (cal.), 308
 supernē, 326
 sur(i)go, 320
 surripio, 291
 sur(ri)pui, 320, 331
 surrupio, 291
 sursum, 331
 suspicio, 199, 398
 sustineo, 435
 susurrus, 181
 sutor, 151

T.

√tab, 291
 tabelai, 262
 tabuleis, 266
 √tac, 291
 tacitus, 306
 √tag, 291
 tarpessita, 20
 Tebere (acc.), 288
 techina, 283
 ted, 326, 418
 √teg, 196, 308
 teg(i)mén, 317, 331
 tego, 349
 tēgula, 197
 tela, 373
 temere, 109
 temetum, 369
 temperi, 303
 templo, 316
 tenax, 108
 tendo, 48, 108
 tene-brae, 109, 402
 teneo, 108
 tener, *ib.*

tenuis, 108, 384
 tepe-facere, 293
 tepeo, 424
 -ter, 303
 ter-mino, 53, 234, 305
 tero, 46, 317
 terrē (base), 289
 terreo, 46
 terrestres, 289
 terr-i-bilis, *ib.*
 tessera, 282
 Tetio(s), 377
 Teurisci, 203
 text(o)rina, 331
 tibi, 355, 359, 360
 tignum, 306, 339, 396
 -tilis, 289
 timeo, 414
 tinguo, 15, 306, 362, 410
 tintinnabulum, 174
 -tinus (tana), 305
 -tion, 27, 412
 titillare, 181
 titubare, *ib.*
 (t)lātum, 371
 -to (pronom.), 318
 toga, 196
 tonitru, 109, 370
 -tor, 140, 397
 toreulum, 407
 torpeo, 370
 torqueo, 46, 406
 torques, 46
 torreo, 395
 tortus, 373
 torus, 369
 tot(i), 329
 trac-si, 361
 tractus, 28
 tragi-comoedia, 290
 √trah, 361
 traiecere, 311
 tra(ns)icio, 373
 traxe (inf.), 318
 tremesco, 305
 trem {i}bundus, 289
 {e}
 tremisco, 305
 tremo, 46
 tremonti, 286
 trepidus, 46, 232
 tribula, 47
 tribulatio, *ib.*
 tribunicus, 398
 -tric, 27
 triobulus, 282

triscurria, 179
 triticum, 46
 Triumpe, 382
 triumphus, 302
 Trupo (Trypho), 382
 tubi-cen, 289
 tugurium, 308
 tuli, 294
 tulisti, *ib.*
 tundo, 370
 turgeo, *ib.*
 turrim, 288
 turtur, 175

V.

ual-de, 317
 Valentium, 400
 Valesium, *ib.*
 uanus, 155, 373
 uapor, 370
 uariiegare, 312
 uarietatis, *ib.*
 Varranus, 355
 Varusa, 355
 uber, 359
 uectum, 132, 361
 √ueh, 105, 132, 361
 uehiculum, 132
 ueh-i-tis, 53
 ueh-u-nt, *ib.*
 ueicos, 199, 207
 ueis = uis, 265 n.
 ueiuos, 199
 √uel, 432
 uel(is), 329
 uella = uilla, 264
 uelle, 237
 uellem, 395
 uenieit, 265
 uenire, 371, 411
 uenter, 371
 uentus, 155
 √uer, 49, 354
 uēr, 170, 354
 uerbum, 160, 359
 uerecundus, 289
 uereor, 124, 145, 160
 Vergili (gen), 311
 uermis, 370
 uerna, 152, 353
 uerrere, 156
 uertex, 303
 uers-i-bus, 289
 uertigo, 292
 Vertum(e)nus, 234, 302

ues, 154
 ue(s)er, 354
 uespa, 17
 uesper, 348
 uesta, 276
 uestis, 154
 ueteris, 303
 ueternus, 348, 353
 uetus, 348
 uia, 132
 uiciens, 400
 uict(o)rix, 315, 331
 uicus, 156, 267
 uideo, 355
 uidēt, 325
 uieis, 311
 uieo, 154
 uiētus, 419 n.
 uigilando, 327 n.
 uigil(is), 329
 uiginti, 336, 371, 430
 -ui (pf.), 201
 uiis, 264, 311
 uilicus, 289
 uillus, 350
 uim, 288
 uimen, 154, 201
 uinc(u)lum, 301, 315, 331
 uindemia, 306
 uindex, *ib.*
 uindico, 305, 306
 uinum, 201
 uiola, 308
 uir, 144, 156
 uirago, 315
 uires, 354
 uirgo, 315
 uiro(m) 284, 378
 uirus, 155
 uis (vb.), 432
 ui(s)i(m), 354
 uisus (uis-sus), 396
 uita (nom.), 328
 uitis, 154, 201
 uitisator, 35 n.
 uitta, 154
 uiuere, 357, 410
 uiuont, 286
 uix (uicius), 318
 uix(is)em, *ib.*
 -ullo, 316
 ulna, 233
 -ulo, 316

uls, 318
 ultus, 373, 397
 ulula, 175
 ululo, 173
 Ulysses, 339
 umbo, 302
 umerus, 233, 345, 428, 433
 -umo, 395 n.
 umor, 345, 373, 428
 unanim-is, 289
 uncia, 286
 undecim, 320
 unguis, 361
 uōc-, 197, 239
 uōco, 197, 237, 407
 uol, 237
 Volcanus, 311
 uolgaris, 402
 uol(i)itis, 331
 uolnus, 311
 uolo, 237, 328, 348
 uolsus, 397
 uolt, 311, 317, 331
 uoltus, 311
 uolucr-is, 289
 uolumus, 286, 300
 uoluo, 237
 uoluptas, 322
 -uolus, 311
 uomeris, 303, 329
 uomo, 237
 -uonsus, 157
 uor, 180
 uorare, 126, 180, 371, 411
 uos, 51 n., 393
 upilio, 407
 upupa, 175
 urguere, 410
 uro, 353
 u/s, 152, 153 n.
 us(s)us, 353, 396
 ustum, 152
 ustus, 396
 utebare, 287
 utere=uteris, *ib.*
 uterere, *ib.*
 ut(i), 329
 u(ui)dus, 317
 ūxor, 322 n.

Z.

zona, 20

